A CRITIQUE OF THE CITY IN THE YAHWIST CORPUS

A DISSERTATION

Submitted to the Graduate School of the

University of Notre Dame in Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

by

John Martin Halligan, S. T. B., S. T. L.

John L McKenzie
Director

J. Blenkinsopp
Co-Director

Department of Theology

University of Notre Dame

May 1975

XUM

I dedicate this work to

Clarence Mark, Jr.

and every member of his family,

who know why

- XUM

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Preface ii
Abbreviations v

Chapter One: Status Quaestionis: The Yahwist Corpus
A. Pentateuchal Criticism Relative to the Yahwist Corpus 1
B. The Yahwist Corpus: A Description 12
C. The Meaning of the Term "City" and its Correlatives 18

Chapter Two: Near Eastern Urban Civilizations Prior to the Davidic Monarchy
A. Mesopotamia 35
B. Egypt 58
C. Canaan 67
1. The Peoples of Canaan 70
2. The Canaanite Social Order 79
a. The Elite 80
b. The Peasantry 83
c. Land Tenure 91
3. The SA.GAZ 96
4. Canaan During the Late Bronze Age 100
Summary 113

Chapter Three: Urban Civilization in the Yahwist Corpus
A. Narratives Concerning Cain: Genesis 4:1-26 115
1. Literary Criticism 116
2. Comment 135
B. Babel: Genesis 11:1-9 165
1. Literary Criticism 165
2. Comment 168
C. Sodom and Gomorrah 176
1. Literary Criticism 13:1-13 176
2. Comment 177
3. Literary Criticism 18:16-33; 19:1-28 181
4. Comment 182
Summary 189

Chapter Four: A Critique of the City in the Yahwist Corpus
A. The Significance of the Ark in Jerusalem 191
B. Gibeon and Hebron 193
C. Jerusalem under David 195
D. Jerusalem under Solomon 199
E. Scribal Activity at Jerusalem 206
F. Mesopotamian, Egyptian and Canaanite Influence 212
G. Conclusions from the Yahwist Corpus 214
Bibliography 223

XUM

PREFACE

The writing of this thesis has been a process of discovery. The process has not concluded; some of the discoveries have become the stuff of this labor. Initially the project appeared to be a straightforward description of the city texts in J and the reporting of their anti-urban bias. It was thought that the texts would reflect the seminomadic distrust of urban life, possibly arranged in the religious context of the desert ideal. But such did not prove to be the case.

It became imperative in the first instance to establish the text of J and a brief review of source criticism revealed how debatable the assignment of texts to J could be. In addition, such terms as city, urbanism, urbanization, and civilization needed clarification. Thus chapter one cleared the table for the investigation of the cultural world of the city in the ancient near east prior to the literary activity of J. The review of Mesopotamian, Egyptian and Syro-Palestinian literature did not disclose a literary model of anti-urban character, so the social features of these cultures were examined. The conclusion became inescapable that the Yahwist had but one font for an anti-urban source: his own ambient of Canaan and its cultural matrix.

A close reading of the texts relating to the city yielded two unanticipated finds: a.) that a literary pattern existed in J that related several disparate texts, and b.) that the context of the city traditions was not that of seminomadic aversions but was unmistakably didactic and contained many affinities with wisdom literature. As the evidence began

to mount, it became clearer and clearer that the anti-urban edge of these texts was linked with the royal policies which had set Israel on a course of return to the Canaanite feudalism rejected by the Israelites of early Yahwism. Thus the anti-urban motif would have roots in the days of the tribal confederation when Yahwism swept Canaan with a covenantal ethic diametrically opposed to the city-state system.

As anyone who has embarked on such a work knows, it does not represent the efforts of one person. Standing alone from the legion of saints who have helped me is John L. McKenzie. John might have washed his hands of years of waiting and many hours of reading and counselling when he left Notre Dame. The thesis was at that time only at the proposal stage. Yet in the unproductive years that ensued -- though liberally sprinkled with promises -- he remained patient and encouraging, always encouraging. He made himself available and visible at every needed moment during the months of writing. And when this work has long rested on the shelf of some paper tomb, what I will remember most about John L. is that he has been a friend and regarded me as no less.

Also, gratitude must be extended to Drs. Joseph Blenkinsopp, J. Massyngberde Ford, and Roberta Chesnut for their patience in reading the thesis. Whatever error remains in the text is mine to own and cannot be given to the omission of my conscientious readers. The assistance that Dr. William Sullivan and Mr. Richard Shick have provided me during these last months has been vital and is much appreciated.

XUM

In yet another way, I must credit Dr. Elizabeth Bellefontaine for the initial impulse to investigate the place of the city in the Old Testament; and Dr. James Flanagan for his interest and critical reflections on my sometimes wayward understanding of the period of David. A word of appreciation must be given to the countless friends, colleagues and relatives who have always expressed their confidence in me at times when I did not have it in myself.

For my wife, Mary Jean, I reserve the fullness of my gratitude. No one has made a greater contribution to this work; it is hers as well as mine. Not even I could have typed and retyped the manuscript while working full time, taking care of two small girls -- and being pregnant. She has also borne the brunt of living with someone specializing in the non-communication of mentally living elsewhere. In all frankness, this presentation is made possible only through her years of faith and love. Amen.

ABBREVIATIONS

AASOR = Annual of the American Schools of Oriental Research, New Haven.

AJA = American Journal of Archaeology. Baltimore.

AJS = American Journal of Sociology. Chicago.

AJSL = American Journal of Semitic Literature. Chicago.

ANET = Ancient Near Eastern Texts Relating to the Old Testament. Edited by J. B. Pritchard. 3rd ed., 1969. Princeton, New Jersey.

BA = The Biblical Archaeologist. New Haven.

BANE = The Bible and the Ancient Near East. Ed. by G. Ernest Wright. Garden City, New York.

BAR = The Biblical Archaeologist Reader. Garden City, New York.

BASOR = Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research. New Haven.

BEThL = Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium. Paris.

BKATN = Biblischer Kommentar Altes Testament. Neukirchen, 1971.

BWAT = Beiträge zur Wissenschaft von Alten Testament. Leipzig. Stuttgart.

BZAW = Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft. Berlin.

CAH = The Cambridge Ancient History. Cambridge.

CBQ = The Catholic Biblical Quarterly. Washington, D. C.

CTM = The Concordia Theological Monthly, Concordia, Mo.

DB = The Dictionary of the Bible. J. L. McKenzie, Milwaukee: Bruce Publishing Company, 1965.

EA = Die El-Amarna-Tafeln I, II. J. A. Knudtzon. Aalen, 1964.

EB = Encyclopedia Biblica. Ed. by T. K. Cheyne et alii. London. 4 Vols.

EsBibl. = Estudios Biblicos. Madrid.

HUCA = Hebrew Union College Annual. Cincinnati.

XUM

IDB = The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible. Ed. by G. A. Buttrick et alii. New York. 4 Vols.

IEJ = Israel Exploration Journal. Jerusalem.

JAOS = Journal of the American Oriental Society. Boston.

JBL = Journal of Biblical Literature. Philadelphia.

JBR = Journal of Bible and Religion. Boston.

JCS = Journal of Cuneiform Studies. New Haven.

JESHO = Journal of the Economic and Social History of the Orient. Leiden.

JNES = Journal of Near Eastern Studies. Chicago.

JPOS = Journal of the Palestinian Oriental Society. Jerusalem.

JQR = Jewish Quarterly Review. Philadelphia.

JTS = Journal of Theological Studies. Oxford.

NEA 20c = Near Eastern Archaeology in the Twentieth Century. Ed. by James A. Sanders. New York.

NEB = New English Bible. Oxford; Cambridge.

OLZ = Orientalistische Literaturzeitung. Berlin.

OTMS = Old Testament in Modern Study. Oxford.

OTS = Oudtestamentische Studiën. Leiden.

PEQ = Palestine Exploration Quarterly. London.

RB = Revue Biblique. Paris.

RGG^3 = Die Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart. Ed. by K. Galling. Tübingen, 1957-1965. 3rd ed. 7 Vols.

RThPh = Revue de Théologie et de Philosophie. Lausanne.

SVT = Supplements to Vetus Testamentum. Leiden.

TD = Theology Digest. St. Mary's, Kan.

XUM

ThPQ = Theologisch-Praktische Quartalschrift. Linz.

ThZ = Theologische Zeitschrift. Basel.

TS = Theological Studies. Woodstock, Md.

UH = Ugaritic Handbook. Cyrus Herzel Gordon. Rome.

VT = Vetus Testamentum. Leiden.

WHJP = The World History of the Jewish People. Ed. by B. Mazar. Jewish History Publications Series I. Tel-Aviv. 3 Vols.

ZA = Zeitschrift für Assyriologie. Leipzig; Berlin.

ZAW = Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft. Berlin.

ZDMG = Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft. Wiesbaden.

ZDPV = Zeitschrift des Deutschen Palästina-Vereins. Wiesbaden.

XUM

CHAPTER I

STATUS QUAESTIONIS: THE YAHWIST CORPUS

This is the study of the social institution known as the "city" as found in the literary tradition of the Yahwist author. Attention will be given to those specific biblical texts in J which better than others exhibit an apparent anti-urban, anti-cultural bias; therefore, the cultural context of the city in the ancient milieu which gave rise to traditions about the city and the circumstances contributing to their inclusion and function in the biblical texts will be examined. It is the purpose then of this thesis to clarify how and for what reason the J author employed these traditions and with what result.

A. PENTATEUCHAL CRITICISM RELATIVE TO THE YAHWIST CORPUS

One of the major questions facing the modern Pentateuchal source critic is whether one should regard the Yahwist literary tradition as a unified work or whether one should see in it several substrata. Martin Noth has responded to the question of dependency between J and E with his Grundlage supposition.[1] While the J and E traditions of Gen. 12-24 are loosely related, the parallel nature of their accounts in the Jacob-Esau (25-36) and Joseph story (37, 39-50) requires an answer as to their interdependence. Noth reasons that a common Grundlage pre-existed in fixed form "either one fixed in writing or one which had already been quite distinctly formed according to structure and content in

---

[1] M. Noth, Überlieferungsgeschichte des Pentateuch, (Stuttgart, 1948). Hereafter cited as: Noth, Pentateuch, English trans. by Bernard W. Anderson, A History of Pentateuchal Traditions, (Englewood Cliffs, N. J., 1972), pp. 38-41.

oral transmission."[2] Thus the major themes of the Pentateuch antedate the Yahwist or Elohist use of them. Through Genesis, Exodus and Numbers the pattern of G can be recognized in outline, yet Noth cautions against wanting to know too much more that is concrete about G.

Whereas Gerhard Von Rad describes the development of the Pentateuch in three stages: a.) the inclusion of the Sinai tradition (into the Settlement tradition), b.) the development of the patriarchal history (and here Von Rad notes several significant contributions of the J writer), and c.) the addition of the primeval history, Noth allows only the last to be the clear labor of the Yahwist; the first two stages derive from G and "thus belong to the material which J took over."[3] J did expand the core material contained in G but certainly not by providing a theme or framework. Thus, according to Noth, the emergence of the literary traditions was gradual, moving from disparate stories of various peoples and locales to crystallizing around a theme (such a process is not unrelated to cult) which in G becomes relatively fixed; then, the literary author composes a larger work imposing his own theological stamp upon the whole. Noth contrasts this with Von Rad's image of the massive literary production by J within a short span of time. There were many decisive

---

[2]Noth, Pentateuch, p. 41.

[3]G. Von Rad, "The Form Critical Problem of the Hexateuch," The Problem of The Hexateuch and Other Essays, trans. by E. W. Trueman Dicken (New York, 1966), pp. 53-63. Hereafter cited as: Von Rad, Hexateuch. Cf. also Noth, Pentateuch, p. 43.

XUM

stages in the process of the formation of the Pentateuch; the Yahwist work was one of many and not as towering as Von Rad would believe.

A further refinement of Noth's postulate of a Grundlage has been provided by G. Fohrer as he distinguishes between a G^1 and a G^2.[4] G^1 cannot be traced in any detail, nor G^2 more than schematically. G^1 represents the oral tradition whose locus vivendi was undoubtedly cultic and whose purpose was often didactic. Narratives supporting territorial claims and their occupation by various Israelite groups and tribes make up the earliest stratum of oral tradition which by the time G^1 had taken thematic shape, had receded in importance; the claims had to all intents and purposes been satisfied. The linking of genealogies, territories, the rise of heroes that acted as vehicles for the unifying factor provided the bulk of material to be given to G^1. G^2 was

> extant in written form at the time of the division of the kingdom after the death of Solomon. This form may well have developed in Jerusalem, where the further expansion and first codification of historical tradition would harmonize with the national consciousness of the era of David and Solomon with its increasing historical consciousness. After the division of the kingdom, G^2 branched into a northern and a southern form.[5]

C. A. Simpson published his lengthy The Early Traditions of Israel in the same year as Noth's Überlieferungsgeschichte des Pentateuch, i.e.,

---

[4]G. Fohrer, Introduction to the Old Testament, initiated by Ernst Sellin, completely revised and rewritten by Georg Fohrer, trans. by David E. Green, (New York, 1968), pp. 127-129. Hereafter cited as: Fohrer, Introduction,

[5]Ibid., p. 130.

in 1948. In contrast to R. Smend and H. Gunkel who had failed to appreciate the political and religious developments that affected the dynamic expansion of the traditions over a vast period of time, Simpson sought to correlate them.

The first systematic attempt to meet the need to relate the religious traditions of Palestine following the settlement to the historical traditions they had brought from the desert was the J^1 narrative. This was expanded by J^2 which in turn was revised and rewritten by E. "In the course of time the J^2 and E documents were conflated and the resultant narrative was eventually fused, after the Exile, with the P document."[6]

The J^1 document is characterized by its interest in origins, patriarchal traditions, tribal traditions; its theology is concerned with Yahweh's activity in history, in particular, the history of Israel. Simpson situates the literary circle at Hebron where Abraham's memory was preserved as well as Isaac's of Beersheba. It was written sometime around the occasion of David's shifting of his capital to Jerusalem.

The J^2 document was prompted by the second crisis, the rupture of the Davidic-Solomonic kingdom. This writer shared none of J^1's confidence in the political framework of Yahweh's vehicle, instead, it was the relationship he covenanted directly with his people. He had the J^1 narrative before him, to this he attached myths and legends, defined more sharply Yahweh's activity in history, expressed greater moral sensitivity, related Beersheba and Shechem traditions. Simpson allows for a few additions to the J^2 document, viz., Gen. 15, and the Blessing of Jacob in chapter 49.

[6] C. A. Simpson, "The Growth of the Hexateuch," The Interpreter's Bible, (New York, 1952), p. 192.

J^1 affected the transformation of the desert religion of Yahwism into a relevant religion for a settled and stable, but ethnically and religiously heterogeneous population. J^2 extended Yahweh's protective and salvific activity to embrace the known civilized world horizontally (in space) and vertically (in time).[7]

Otto Eissfeldt has identified a Laienquelle source as the older, more primitive, and even more secular a source than J.[8] He notes a sharp contrast between L on the one hand, and J and P on the other, in the primeval history. L pictures men as nomads, J and P think of them as farmers. According to Eissfeldt, "nomadic" is a clear sign of older, cruder elements and milieu. Cain's offspring head up three nomadic groups: Jabal, the father of cattlemen; Jubal, the father of musicians; and Tubal-cain, the father of metalworkers. This simple listing knows of no other men. The nomadic refrain reappears in ch. 11:1 as L reports that men were "wandering in the east." The Sinai experience relates the tensions plaguing Israel and

---

[7]Cf. C. A. Simpson, The Early Traditions of Israel: A Critical Analysis of the Pre-Deuteronomic Narrative of the Hexateuch (Oxford, 1948), pp. 427-580. Cf. also, idem, Composition of the Book of Judges (Oxford, 1957), in particular the Appendix: "The Literary Structure of the J Document in the Hexateuch," pp. 149-196.

[8]O. Eissfeldt, The Old Testament: An Introduction (New York, 1965), trans. by Peter Ackroyd, p. 193. Idem, Die Altesten Traditionen Israels. Ein kritischer Bericht uber C. A. Simpson's The Early Traditions of Israel, BZAW 71 (1950), passim. Cf. also, Eissfeldt's brief review of Simpson's work in Geschichtsschreibung im Alten Testament: Ein kritischer Bericht uber die neueste Literatur dazu. (Berlin, 1948), p. 48.

XUM

her dismissal from Yahweh's presence. The Ark is the symbolic presence of Yahweh in L not a joyous immediacy as seen in J. Sinai remains his abode to which men (as nomads) must, if he wills them, return from time to time. From this Eissfeldt sees further support for the allegation that L is thereby "giving expression to his enthusiasm for the nomadic ideal."[9] The "true home of Israel and Yahweh" is "the desert with its mountain of God."

But Eissfeldt produces further criteria. The literary form of L is primitive in that the narratives follow one another with little real connection save their relative chronology. L narratives exhibit clearer and purer elements of national and tribal history than J and E (the similarity to Simpson's J^1 is patent).

A terminus a quo for the dating of the L source is that of the reign of David, more probably towards the end of it. The activity of Amos and Hosea has left no trace in L so one must assume that the terminus ad quem will predate them. The period of Jehu's revolution seems to be a compelling date for L because the Rechabites were active and exhibited "a negative attitude toward agriculture."[10] L's reserve for the land of Canaan with its settled ways and cults also bears a vein of "reaction against the policy of Solomon which was favorable to Canaanite civilization." Eissfeldt does not ask himself if the nomadic traces in L may be evidence of archaizing, nor why L might not be reacting against an historically more proximate figure such as Omri or Ahab. He prefers the prophetic social stratum as the origin of L; he regards the priestly and

---

[9] Ibid., 196.

[10] Ibid., 198. Contra Eissfeldt, cf. F. S. Frick, "The Rechabites Re-Considered," JBL 90 (1971), pp. 279-287.

XUM

prophetic circles as the exclusive bearers of tradition and education.

The common characteristics of the J source, according to Eissfeldt, are: the preference for the divine name Yahweh, anthropomorphisms, psychological insights into character, deftness in depicting a scene in a minimum of strokes, the use of foreshadowing, and so forth. That the prophetic thought had some influence on J is felt decisive for Eissfeldt in placing J around 750 B. C., but going back, perhaps, to the ninth century in inception. He gives surprisingly little importance as to where L, J, or E were written: "in view of the fact that the border between N and S obviously did not exist for the intellectual traditions of Israel and that they were cherished with the same zeal and the same love on both sides of the border, it also does not matter much where L, J, and E originated, whether in the S or the N state."[11]

That Eissfeldt's separation into two distinct and independent sources, L and J, has not altered since 1922 in the face of general non-acceptance by the vast majority of critics, has not dissuaded Fohrer from renewing the argument in the last decade. Mention has already been made of his refinement of Noth's Grundlage into G^1 (oral stage) and G^2 (written stage). What was textually an unspecified tradition in Noth, Fohrer has bifurcated. What was a relatively unified tradition with Vorlage and Ausbau in Noth has become four separate but related strata in Fohrer: G^1, G^2, J and N (Nomadic Stratum). Fohrer prefers to speak of "strata" rather than strands, documents,

---

[11] Idem, "Genesis," Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible, II (New York, 1962), pp. 373-374.

authors, or schools.

> The continuous sources or narrative strands of the Pentateuch cannot be termed documents. They are more stratified and complex, often less tangible in wording and, on account of the use of ancient material, less exclusively the work of a single author than the term 'document' suggests.[12]

He feels that the word "source" also fails to describe the situation accurately, while the phrase "narrative strand" leaves the legal material out of account. Traditio-critical analysis refutes the idea that the works are products of schools of narrators, showing that the absence of formal uniformity should be understood as evidence of the author's dependence upon the long and complex history of transmission.

There is a rough equation to be made concerning the material commonly allocated to J^1 (Simpson), L (Eissfeldt), and N (Fohrer). Simpson and Eissfeldt date J^1 and L as the earliest; Fohrer does not do so for N. J and E made use of the later presentation (G^2), while N, "after its conservative fashion," made use of G^1. N must be considered to follow J as a reply to the theological perspective of J. In the primeval history Fohrer finds two mutually exclusive views of man's progress since creation: a.) J leads downward in a straight line to sin and judgment, and b.) N exhibits a regular rhythm of positive events, a violent or arrogant advance on the part of man, followed by repulse. Several narratives and motifs occur not twice (sufficient, therefore, would be J and E) but thrice; e.g., Sarah is endangered not only in Gen. 20 and 26, but also in 12:10-20.[13] The multiple names for Moses' father-in-law are linguistic evidence for a third source stratum.

---

[12] Fohrer, Introduction, p. 114.

[13] Ibid., p. 159.

Fohrer attributes to N the primeval history, viz., Gen. 2:8-9 (conflated with J): 3:18-19aa, 21, 22b, 24; 4:17-24; 6:1-4; 9:21-27; 11:1-9. N imitates J in style but diverges sharply in content. His pièce-de-résistance for entitling this source stratum "N" is the incorporation of archaic material bearing unmistakably nomadic traits. In one group Fohrer places the Noah oracles, Gen. 9:25-27, the Song of Miriam, Ex. 15:20-21, the Song of the Banner, Ex. 17:16, and the covenant meal narrative in Ex. 24:1-2, 9-11, a singularly nomadic custom; a second group would include the narratives dealing with the tribal histories: Gen. 25:1-6; a final grouping adds the Song of Lamech, Gen. 4:23-24, Jacob's wrestling in Gen. 32:24-32, the ambush of Moses, Ex. 4:24-26, and possibly the robbing of the Egyptians, Ex. 3:21-22; 11:2-3; and 12:35-36.

From this assortment of texts Fohrer concludes that N views man's repeated contacts with civilization as the root cause for his presumption and pride in his own achievements and this attitude necessitates punishment. In contrast to J and E, N bears a fierce hostility toward the milieu of civilization. In harmony with Eissfeldt, Fohrer writes: "At his best, as a true man of faith, man is nomad."[14] The first men in the Cainite genealogy know no other civilization but the nomadic, and then in 11:1 the people simply wander before building a city and a tower. The Israelite departure from Mt. Sinai and the trek to the promised land are viewed as the result of banishment from Yahweh's presence.

---

[14] Ibid., p. 164.

If N is seen as a conservative response to J's exuberance with civilization, then a southern Judahite origin around 800 would be appropriate, southern, because the nomadic way of life was preserved there the longest and cattle-raising was the predominant and preferred means of living. Fohrer would rather a post-Solomonic dating because he sees J's political enthusiasm as an intellectual's call to unity in the teeth of the fact of division. The theology of J, its contents and origin all agree with Eissfeldt's description of J in the main. With S. Mowinckel, Fohrer would make the J author a court historiographer or wise man in the royal entourage at Jerusalem.[15]

Noteworthy among the modern French scholars is the figure of Henri Cazelles. He joins with those who would see two redactions of the J source.[16] Without doubt the major redaction took place during the united monarchy with its court at Jerusalem. Cazelles points to two fundamental problems which J confronted: 1.) the need to impress upon his people the necessity of remaining faithful to the God of the commandments, despite the attraction of Egyptian wisdom or Canaanite fertility cults, and 2.) how to explain in the concrete, the manner in which Yahweh rules his people through their leaders. A concern of J is Yahweh's selection of the younger in preference to the elder in the patriarchal history. This leads Cazelles to believe that J must have been redacted by someone contemporaneous with the succession of Solomon.

---

[15] Ibid., p. 152.

[16] H. Cazelles, "Pentateuque," Supplément Dictionnaire de la Bible, fasc. 39 (Paris, 1964), cols. 771-803. Hereafter cited as: Cazelles, Pentateuque.

Although the author is definitely from the south (e.g., his use of the traditions of the southern sanctuaries of Hebron, Beersheba, and Kadesh), he harbors no ill feelings toward the north (he includes the stories of Shechem and Bethel, Abraham and Jacob's journeys to them, and the Joseph story).

Yet there remains a residue of material which is markedly different from the author so much at ease with Babylonian mythology and tribal politics. Cazelles believes there is good reason for positing one redaction at the time of David, in particular at the time he moved the royal residence from Hebron to Jerusalem, and another during the last hours of the united monarchy. Perhaps the earlier one contained texts dealing with establishing the legitimacy of David at Hebron which was transposed to support the legitimacy of Solomon. The court history of David's rise to the monarchy has close affinities with J in theme and technique but need not come from the same hand. Cazelles maintains that in the final analysis there is not sufficient evidence of mutual exclusion (therefore, independent) or conflict of interests (thus Simpson) to warrant dividing J into J^1 (L, K, S) and J^2. There is much truth to the southern milieu that R. Pfeiffer suggests but not enough to identify a new source, because the same one who knew of these traditions also incorporated those of the north so as to proclaim la légitimité de la dynastie de David pour tout Israël. The redactor is none other than Abiathar, expelled to Anathoth at the inception of the reign of Solomon.[17]

---

[17] Ibid., col. 802.

Artur Weiser writes that the Yahwist strand is best understood in the light of the heilsgeschichtliche recitation of events seen as purposive acts of Yahweh in behalf of his people. The stories taken over by the Yahwist are imbued with this sense of "history" but obviously enjoy portraying the roles of the human actors within them. "It is precisely in the interaction of Yahweh and human beings that the original interest of the Yahwist is focused. And it is in this that the peculiar greatness of the Yahwist work consists."[18]

He feels there is no need to account for the specific editions, distinct and separate theologies (based in the fashion of L, K, S, or N) within the J work. Many conflations are apparent in the text but one does not make their meaning or relationship clearer by terming one J^1, another J^2, and so forth.

B. THE YAHWIST CORPUS: A DESCRIPTION

There exists a wide area of agreement among contemporary writers concerning the Yahwist's sources. The Babylonian material would form one block were it not for the fact that it is intimately interwoven with the Yahwist theology so that none of it appears untouched by the transforming hand of J. That his material was at hand in written form is unlikely; nevertheless, the contrary cannot be proven either. Exactly what traditions J received is also unknown with any degree of accuracy. In general it is assumed that traditions arising at various cult centers were known to J and consequently formed the raw material from which he constructed his saga. Patriarchal traditions seem to

---

[18] A. Weiser, The Old Testament: Its Formation and Development, trans. by Dorothea M. Barton, 4th ed. (New York, 1968), p. 100. Hereafter cited as: Weiser, Formation.

XUM

admit of one cycle originating in southern Judah, probably the region of Hebron; another (Jacob-Joseph) would have arisen in the central highlands. Noth would see one series, Jacob-Laban, in East Jordan, and another, Shechem-Bethel, west of the Jordan. Tribal traditions were incorporated in story form as well as cultic traditions within legal material. The Sinai tradition may come from southern tribes, the Exodus from Ephraimitic tribes; Settlement traditions are more difficult to place.

As the oldest portions of J, Weiser includes 1.) the Song of Lamech 2.) the Oracles of Noah, 3.) the Blessing of Jacob, 4.) the Oracles of Balaam, 5.) the Yahwistic Decalogue (Ex. 34:10-26), and 6.) the Red Sea Song (Ex. 15:1-8). The suggestion is not implied that the J narrative developed from these pieces but rather that they are examples of earlier material which J incorporated into his saga. Von Rad notes that the "short Historical credo" of Dt. 26:5b-9 would obviously antedate the literary activity of J but more importantly, it would furnish J with a framework for his narrative. Through a series of adaptations and expansions the creed was enlarged, principally through narrative and cultic material while it still, in its briefest form, embodied the heart of the Settlement and Sinai traditions. Such efforts, while not conclusive, indicate that the Yahwist sources are multiple: cultic, both oral and written, Israelite and non-Israelite.

If one views J as a creative writer rather than a simple compiler then

the purpose of the J author may be found in the Abraham tradition of Gen. 12:1-4a, as Hans W. Wolff has suggested.[19] Through the model of Abraham, Israel (Solomonic Israel, the time of J) was to be the medium of salvation for all the nations. Wolff writes: "It must have been a cutting word to the hubris of those who lived ostentatiously in Solomon's days to learn that their greatness would be attained as a blessing of Yahweh only when through them all the nations had found blessing as deliverance to a free productive life."[20] In order to accomplish this with the greatest finesse he combines the extant traditions of Sinai, the Exodus, and the many tribal stories of patriarchs, prefaces the lot with an account of the origin of the curse (Gen. 2-11), and presents a "history" of how Yahweh has acted on their behalf so that they may have both motive and example to do the same. This observation of Wolff has much in common with Von Rad's evaluation of the Yahwist's theology.[21]

Wolff declares that J, in a manner which is neither rationally justifiable nor yet capable of detailed explanation, that the ultimate purpose of the redemption which God will bring about in Israel is that of bridging the gulf between God and the entire human race. Therefore, his interests are not

---

[19]H. W. Wolff, "The Kerygma of the Yahwist," Interpretation 20 (1966), pp. 131-158.

[20]Ibid., p. 155.

[21]Von Rad, Hexateuch, p. 66.

cultic nor legal nor prophetic but apparently often political. The great saving acts of Yahweh in the Sinai and Settlement traditions have not only roots in the patriarchal episodes but also may be seen in the contemporary events of the tenth century. The main emphasis in Yahweh's dealings with his people is now to be sought outside the sacral institutions.

In a similar vein Noth speaks of J's creation of the Urgeschichte as the most telling indication of his interest in the relationship of man to God in history. His theological portrayal of the nature of man is never again given so clearly. J envisions how from the very beginning man has lived in the world and continues to live as one who himself wants to "be like God" and therefore in his whole being is disobedient to God, for which cause he is subjected to the curse of God. With this backdrop J may proceed to speak of how -- in spite of man's efforts to defeat the purpose of Yahweh -- through Abraham and his descendants, Yahweh would bless mankind. He, not man, is the Lord of History.

Why the Yahwist wrote is closely connected to the question: for whom did he write? A period of relative peace followed the vigorous military campaigns of David and the rebellion of Absalom and ensued down to the end of the reign of Solomon. With this peace came prosperity, leisure, a time for inquiry, for a flourishing of intellectual refinement. The self-awareness that Israel had become a world power among other nations had dawned on them; the influx of wealth, exercise of dominion, gave a basis for the self-assurance reflected in the Yahwist tradition. That it is Yahweh who had directed the events of history so that from a small landless band

XUM

of believers they had grown into a powerful nation is not missing in his pages either.

The audience was sophisticated in the arts of political intrigue if one is to read the contemporary accounts of the rise of Saul and David and indeed, the succession of Solomon, aright. The religio-political union of the tribes ended but was not dismissed from memory with the establishment of the monarchy. With the centralization of political power in the kingship came the accompanying desire to centralize worship. The most propitious means to accomplish both was to select and establish the new order in an advantageous center, viz., the Jebusite city of Jerusalem.[22]

Cultivated Canaanites from various parts of the kingdom would also have contributed to the intellectual ambient of the Yahwist. Mythologies of Mesopotamia and Canaan would be known in Jerusalem, as well as folklore from the newly conquered tribes and, more importantly, from those of the defunct tribal federation.

The religious mood was syncretistic. The polyethnic populace was not converted to a man to Yahwism as Judges 1:1-36 reports. Local shrines antedating the settlement probably continued practices from pre-Mosaic times which did not mesh with Yahwism at all. John Bright remarks that the Canaanite worship of Yahweh retained so much of Baalism that the two could no longer be distinguished with ease.[23] The Yahwist's ability to appeal to a

---

[22]Recall Jereboam I's need to quickly provide a rival cult center at Bethel following the North's secession during the reign of Solomon's son, Rehoboam.

[23]J. Bright, History of Israel (Philadelphia, 1959), p. 156.

wide range of people may be seen in Gen. 2-3 wherein he censures the Canaanite fertility cults in bold but skillfully nuanced strokes.[24] His reworking of myths, Mesopotamian in origin but mediated through Canaanite writings, would appeal to those educated Canaanites who may have been well disposed toward Yahwism while the simplicity of the story line would not have been lost on the less literate Israelite or Canaanite.

Thus one may conclude that it was to the elite that the Yahwist primarily addressed himself because it would be only among them that the full understanding would be possible. Yet the lesson value of his stories was evident enough, in view of its popular character, to be appreciated and retained by the commoners. He spoke to a people that had witnessed the rise of the monarchy in Israel, the development of political, social and religious unity, the zenith of material prosperity, and who therefore looked to the future with singular confidence in their God, king and nation.

The author of the present thesis is in agreement with Cazelles and Wolff with regard to a Solomonic dating for the J corpus. Further, the quality and power of the narrative would indicate the inner circle of the most literate men of the realm as the origin, most probably the wise men at court. Concerning the question of whether or not the Yahwist is one or many, this writer would think that several have contributed in a literary

---

[24] J. L. McKenzie, "The Literary Characteristics of Genesis 2-3," TS 15 (1954), pp. 541-572.

XUM

fashion to the J corpus; a continuous series of reworkings, insertions and modifications were in progress throughout the period of the united monarchy. The attempt to place the composition of J at a fixed point during the reign of David or at the end of Solomon's demonstrates the need to view the entire period as the time spectrum within which it was written.

C. THE MEANING OF THE TERM "CITY" AND ITS CORRELATIVES

By the time the Yahwist corpus came into being Jericho was half its present age. Not only Jericho but several sites in Canaan had enjoyed a long urban history prior to 1000 B. C.[25] No matter which definition or whatever theory of city origins one maintains the fact stands fast that at the time of the Yahwist writing urban culture had long been a dynamic phenomenon in the land of Canaan. In the same manner that food gathering in harvest time had become a religiously enriched event over the course of centuries among agriculturalists, so also did the city assume greater and greater cultural and religious significance

---

[25]A precise dating of Jericho's passage from village to city status is not available; however, the generally recognized approximate time is 6800 B. C. Cf. G. E. Wright, "The Archaeology of Palestine," BANE pp. 89-93. In Canaan, Megiddo, Hazor, Lachish, Gezer, Arad, Taanach, Beth-shean and Tirzah, to list but a few, urban settlements begin to exist sometime between 3150 and 1200 B. C. Cf. Y. Aharoni, The Macmillan Bible Atlas (London, 1968), pp. 22-24, fig. 17. The confluence of several disciplines in this study is unavoidable, for example, the well established but far from blissful relationship between archaeology and literary analysis. With respect to the "city" yet other disciplines enter the dialogue, viz., sociology and cultural anthropology (which are themselves still in the process of discovering one another). A judicious use of the findings from these fields has a long tradition in Old Testament study; observations made here depend on prudent models as guides down the investigative path.

in the life of civilized peoples. What is of critical importance in this study is the multivalence the city came to possess in the Yahwist corpus.

Lewis Henry Morgan, the nineteenth century American anthropologist, developed a scheme for cultural evolution which has had considerable influence on succeeding generations of scholars, analogous perhaps to that of Wellhausen in scriptural studies. Morgan divided the process of civilization into three periods each possessing several subdivisions. Mankind's origins are in the period he designated as "savagery" characterized by the invention of fire, beginnings of articulate speech, fish subsistence, use of bow and arrow, and ends with the rise of tribal organization; the second epoch is that of "barbarism" which begins with the art of pottery, domestication of animals, iron smelting, and concludes with the invention of a phonetic alphabet; the final phase is the use of the phonetic alphabet in a dramatic way, namely the invention of writing.[26]

Writing in the wake of Morgan's cultural evolutionism was the prominent pre-historian Vere Gordon Childe. Childe was unabashedly Marxist in his approach to describing the process of civilization in terms of its material

---

26 L.H. Morgan, Ancient Society, ed. E. Leacock, (New York, 1877, 3rd rep. 1969), pp. 9-12. Morgan's view of cultural evolution was unaware of the discontinuous character of evolutionary advance. Darwinian determinism was lacking in Morgan's work but there remains a current of it in the preordained character of his evolutionism. Cf. R. Mc. Adams, The Evolution of Urban Society: Early Mesopotamia and Pre-Hispanic Mexico, (Chicago, 1966), p.6.

contents and achievements. To describe the process by which preliterate agriculturalists living in towns and villages first came to form larger, more complex, civilized societies, he introduced the term "urban revolution". Where Morgan had posited the advent of writing as the benchmark of civilization he had failed to recognize the advent of cities as a decisive development in the stages of civilization. Childe employed an inductive method in describing the phenomenon of the city; also, unlike Morgan, Childe was more intent on grasping the processes of civilization than constructing a syllabus of "civilized" traits. The emergence of state polity, social stratification, institutionalizing of religion, and of political authority are the processes within the concept of urban revolution. Among the criteria of civilization, Childe noted these:

(1) an increase in settlement size toward "urban" proportions,[27]

(2) a centralized accumulation of capital resulting from the importance of tribute or taxation,[28]

(3) monumental public works,

(4) the invention of writing,

---

[27] In se these traits do not constitute either a city complex or a civilized society. It is only when congeries of traits occur that a reasonable assumption of urban life may be made for a given locale. Louis Wirth, "Urbanism as a Way of Life," AJS 44 (1938), pp. 46-63, has developed the possibilities of this criterion. But A.J. Reiss, Jr. argues that empirically large size and big density of population are not always conditions for an urban life form, cf., "An Analysis of Urban Phenomena," The Metropolis in Modern Life, ed. R. M. Fisher, (Garden City, 1955), p. 43.

[28] V. G. Childe, "Early Forms of Society," A History of Technology I, ed. C. Singer, (Oxford, 1954), pp. 49-52.

XUM

(5) advances toward exact and predictive sciences,[29]

(6) the appearance and growth of long-distance trade in luxuries,

(7) the emergence of a class stratified society,

(8) the substitution of a politically organized society based on territorial principles, the state, for one based on kinship,

(9) the appearance of representational art.[30]

Childe understood that there were primary and secondary variables among these; the basic features without which the city could not emerge were: a.) "the conversion of luxuries into necessities", and b.) "an increase, and above all a concentration of the social surplus".[31] What is remarkable about Childe's theory is that the rise of the city is not hidebound to the framework of an evolutionary stage theory. Urban revolution views not the pre- and post-phase hinging on one factor but sees a "process of transformation in basic institutional patterns that occurred over a period of time".[32]

Wirth suggested that from the three variables of number, density of settlement and heterogeneity of urban population, all the characteristics of urbanism might be derived.[33] The urban personality and social organization are such products; the urban personality would be characterized by reserve,

---

29 Ibid., p. 54.

30 Idem, "The Urban Revolution," Town Planning Review, 21 (1950), pp. 3-17.

31 Idem, "Early Forms of Society," A History of Technology I, ed. C. Singer, (Oxford, 1954), p. 45.

32 R. McC. Adams, "The Urban Revolution," The International Encyclopedia of Social Sciences, V., (Chicago, 1968), p. 202.

33 Wirth, AJS, 44 (1938), pp. 46-63.

XUM

indifference, sophistication, tolerance, competition, self-aggrandizement, exploitation. It would also exhibit feelings of friction, irritation, nervous tension, acceptance of instability and insecurity, and marked degrees of personal disorganization.[34] Civilization, urbanism, urbanization are terms susceptible of a wide semantic range among sociologists, anthropologists, and biblical historians. Wirth has reduced urbanism to the three variables of number, density, and social heterogeneity. Childe has defined civilization in terms of the ten traits (the number varies between nine or more) mentioned above with emphasis on the two pivotal ones of a conversion from luxuries to necessities and greater concentration of social surplus. In this study urbanism will be understood as a special way of life characterized by the traits Wirth has derived from his three variables. While it must be conceded Wirth had the modern industrial city in mind when he made his analysis, his model does not a fortiori become inoperative when applied to the pre-industrial city. Robert Dewey has elaborated on these notes from Wirth and drawn up a rather extensive series of traits which characterize life in the urban center:

> greater importance of secondary, rather than primary contacts; greater interdependence of specialists; less dependence upon particular individuals, impersonal, transitory, superficial, segmental, and utilitarian social contacts; less integrated social organization; pecuniary nexus, exaggerated importance of time; predatoriness; formal controls; anonymity; flexible caste structure but sharpened and ramified differentiation by income and social status; heightened mobility;

---

34 R. Dewey, "The Rural-Urban Continuum: Real but Relatively Unimportant", AJS, 66 (1960), pp. 61-62.

> involuntary segregation of racial, linguistic, income, and class groups; more tenancy, rapid turnover of membership groups tangential to each other; greater importance of symbols and stereotypes; standardization of products and processes; gearing of facilities and institutions to the average user; subordination of individuality; weakened bonds of kinship; decline of the social significance of the family; loss of the traditional basis of solidarity; disappearance of neighborhood; high rate of gainful employment of adults; and replacement of territorially based social units with interest groups.[35]

It seems that any definition of urbanism in terms of traits falls prey to the charge of a circular argument. This way of life is urban because it has these traits; these traits are urban because they are common to this way of life termed urban. Nevertheless one may set it over against urbanization which is a process of population concentration in which the ratio of urban people to the total population in a territory increases and is accompanied by the appearance of urban traits. It may also refer to the process whereby the rural hinterland is diffused by the influence of an urban center.[36]

As it will be seen in the succeeding chapter, the urban centers in Mesopotamia and Canaan display many of the traits that Dewey has highlighted; likewise, at various moments certain cities become city-states as urbanization which had produced the city continues while the city extends its influence over the countryside, politically, culturally, and religiously.

---

35 Ibid., pp. 62-63.

36 Cf. A. J. Reiss, Jr., A Dictionary of the Social Sciences, ed. by J. Gould and W. J. Kelb, (Glencoe, 1964), pp. 738-739.

V. G. Childe has reacted to Kathleen Kenyon and Sir Mortimer Wheeler's apparently loose usage of the terms civilization, city, and town.[37] Kenyon's find of an early settlement of mud houses with a small fortified wall prompted the suggestion that this "town" was the earliest known (her first dating of 8000 B. C. was revised down to 5000 B. C.) beginning of urban civilization. Wheeler, commenting on Kenyon's find, declared it the first town (accepting a figure of approximately 7000 B. C.) because it was a settled community of sufficient size to support a group of non-agricultural specialists, had public works that implied a stable administration; he did not view writing as a necessary condition for terming a site, urban. It was Childe's insistence on this last note that led him to disagree so vehemently with Kenyon and Wheeler. He saw writing as the critical mark of the emergence of a "quite novel socio-economic structure", the city. Villages may be walled, have monumental sewers, expert craftsmen, clergy, and a stable government but it does not make them cities. Literature is the conditio sine qua non for the designation, city. He further argued that research over the past several decades had led to a common understanding that villages were pre-urban, that cities were not villages, and that anything in between were towns.

Civilization is a complex of interrelated social systems which allows its participants to interact in a variety of ways progressively improving their entire standard of life. Civilization is both a pre-condition for the city's emergence and simultaneously the peculiar product of the city.

---

37 Cf. V. G. Childe, "Civilization, Cities, and Towns," Antiquity, 31 (1957), pp. 36-38; K. Kenyon, "Jericho and Its Setting in Near Eastern History," Antiquity, 30 (1956), pp. 184-195; M. Wheeler, "The First Towns?" Antiquity, 30 (1956), pp. 132-136.

XUM

The final term in the thesis to be clarified is the term "city".[38] It has been noted that Childe and Wirth have provided extensive descriptions of the city's traits. In recent years Gideon Sjoberg has reminded scholars that the city models used in definitions have all been predicated on the industrial model. The criticism has greater applicancy to Wirth than Childe. Thus, Sjoberg would define the pre-industrial city (in contrast to a village or town) "as having greater size, density, and heterogeneity and including a wide range of non-agricultural specialists, most significant of whom are the literati".[39] The key variable accounting for distinctions between

---

38 Something perhaps should be said regarding the wealth of research produced in the late nineteenth century in Europe. Urban theory may have begun with Fustel de Coulanges who took the critical social institution of the city to be religion. He writes that the day on which several tribes (included within them would be families and phratries) associated for multiple reasons but also on the condition that the religion of each would be respected, the city was born. Cf. de Coulanges, The Ancient City, (New York, 1956), pp. 126-227. F. Keutigen in Germany held that cities were first towns regarded as strongholds for emergency purposes, later in peace time, a farming market and community attached itself. Henri Pirenne stated that two attributes were necessary: a middle class population and communal organization. Max Weber in speaking of the genuine urban community notes that it should exhibit these features: 1.) a fortification, 2.) a market, 3.) a court of its own and at least partially autonomous law, 4.) a related form of association, and 5.) at least partial autonomy and autocephaly, thus also, an administration by authorities in the election of whom the burghers participated. Cf. M. Weber, The City trans. and ed. by D. Martindale and G. Neuwirth, (New York, 1966), pp. 48-49, 80-81.

39 G. Sjoberg, The Pre-Industrial City, (New York, 1960), p. 11.

XUM

pre-industrial and industrial cities is the power source; early man used animate sources, animals and men; industrial man uses inanimate power sources.[40] Sjoberg continues to define the city in the tradition of Morgan and Childe in his stress on the cardinal place of technology in the evolution from the pre-city to city. The cultural anthropologist Robert McC. Adams views the rise of cities as a social process,

> an expression more of changes in man's interaction with his fellows than in his interaction with his environment. Exploitation of the environment characterizes pre-urban living, features such as the development of new tools and techniques and the discovery of new and more dependable resources for subsistence.[41]

Adams accepts and employs the term "urban revolution" as Childe had before him. The most important advance that Adams brings to the discussion is that the city itself cannot be described in its essence as a combination of Wirth variables or as being called into existence by the discovery of writing nor any combination of technological advances. The city is a unique form of mutual relations among men living in close proximity, for diverse social, economic, political, and religious purposes. Frank Smith Frick concurs with Adams that the rise of cities was due to a social change rather than an environmental one; however, he follows the lead of Sjoberg in detail

---

40 Idem, "The Pre-Industrial City," Cities and Society, ed. by P. Hatt and A. J. Reiss, Jr., (Glencoe, 1964), p. 187.

41 R. McC. Adams, "The Origin of Cities," Scientific American, 203 (1960), pp. 153-168.

regarding the make-up of the ancient city.[42]

Lewis Mumford has isolated as the core of the ancient city, the nucleus within it, the citadel. The inner city enclosed with its high ramparts, normally situated on a hill or knoll within the city limits, housed the temple, the palace, the storehouses and water supply (or some equivalent such as an aquaduct or cistern). The elite and powerful lived within it, the remainder of the people about it, protected or unprotected by another outer wall. The market, law court, and guildshops were outside the citadel.[43]

In this study greater attention will be given to the city in the Yahwist writings in the light of Adams' distinction between the sociological, technological aspect and the human institutions which constitute the urban Lebensform. Cities serve as dwelling places, but they are also places that people sing of, lament over, are lonesome in and for, flee from or seek refuge in; the city is an epicenter of emotions, conflicting opinions, and biases. Few people regard the city dispassionately and it is the primary purpose of this investigation to discover how the Yahwist regarded it. In world literature the city has been viewed as the apogee of human achievement and as the Ursprung of evil, as the arena of human alienation or salvation. The biblical texts would seem to indicate that there were multiple views on the meaning of urban life; this study will not attempt to prove which view

---

42 F. S. Frick, The City in the Old Testament, an unpublished doctoral dissertation, (Princeton, 1970), p. 97. Hereafter cited as: Frick, The City.

43 L. Mumford, "The City: Its Form and Function," International Encyclopedia of Social Sciences II, (Chicago, 1968), pp. 447-455.

was normative for Israel. The significance of such conflicting views so posed in the text lies in their being there at all, for this signifies that man is not indifferent to cities, but charges them with values and beliefs.

D. MOST RECENT LITERATURE ON THE CITY IN THE OLD TESTAMENT

The status quaestionis of the present study has been reviewed in the preceding pages in sufficient detail. The only recent work centering on the city in the Old Testament has been Frank Smith Frick's. His doctoral dissertation at Princeton in 1970 encompasses all the urban phenomena in pre-exilic Israel, to wit, from the thirteenth century B. C. to the fall of Jerusalem in 587 B. C. Frick has drawn upon the sociologist, Gideon Sjoberg, because of his emphasis on religion as the structural backbone of the pre-industrial city.[44] Of particular importance to Frick is the challenge Sjoberg throws down at the close of his work that the ultimate test of the urban typology that he has worked out will be its application in reconstructing "the social arrangements in cities long since dead". The immediate prospect is to extrapolate "to the past from the present data on more recent feudal cities, utilizing in the process, recent advances in the social scientists knowledge of social systems". Frick adopts Sjoberg's analysis as a working model so as to give "fuller meaning

---

[44] Sjoberg writes: "...it is no source of wonder that religion forms the very marrow of the normative structure of education in the feudal city. What men study, what they think about, what they create are intimately related to the spiritual values of the city and the society". The Pre-Industrial City, p. 270.

to written records" and greater facility in reconstructing "where gaps exist in the data".[45]

At the outset Frick acknowledges that his study might well be regarded as an attempt "to write a chapter in urban history", in which use is made of a theoretical framework supplied by urban sociology.[46] This may also be the fairest description of its approach to the biblical text because the study displays little interest in a form-critical, or traditionsgeschichtliche, or redactionsgeschichtliche, or any other familiar scriptural methodology. It is Frick's aim to provide a "functionally causal analysis" in the manner of the social anthropologist, and to set his description within the "historical-contextual" perspective utilized by the cultural historian and archaeologist.[47]

Frick proceeds to test Sjoberg's thesis against the Old Testament text and archaeological evidence with particular attention to the key components

---

45 Ibid., p. 333.

46 Frick, The City, p. iv.

47 Frick defines functional, causal analysis as seeking "to establish functionally causal relationships between the physical and 'moral' density of settlement units and the social and cultural characteristics generally associated with them". The historical-contextual perspective "views the city as a locus of interaction of diverse cultural traditions and tries to trace the conditions and consequences of such interaction in the formation and transformation of new cultural traditions". op. cit., p. v.

of ecology, class, family, economy, politics, religion, and education. It would seem that the term "literary traditions" has a generic meaning in the work for he speaks only once of a "J" author (nothing of P, E, or D) in chapter three; the archaeological evidence is well presented but does leave much to be fetched from the copious footnotes.

Following a thorough review of the word usage of עיר, its cognates, Ugaritic usage, and synonyms, Frick concludes in chapter one that the word designates in the order of frequency of meaning:

1.) a fortified structure for defensive purposes;
2.) a walled, permanent settlement;
3.) a quarter within such a settlement, especially a citadel containing the temple(s) and the administrative headquarters;
4.) in a more comprehensive political and economic sense, the city includes the citadel, the fixed settlement, and is the center of and marketplace for the surrounding secondary settlement of less permanent nature.[48]

Frick next examines the nature of the city in its physical, social, economic and political structures during the Israelite Monarchy. Why a site became a city is explored with reference to hills, tells, springs and proximity to trade routes and arable land. Following modern sociological theory which abandons the rigid dichotomy between rural and urban, Frick makes a strong case for fresh thinking in this area. He examines the social bifurcation of the

---

[48] Frick, The City, p. 21. It is apparent that the biblical usage does not conveniently correspond with the sociologist's definition of a city, however, it is the biblical view that the present study seeks to reveal. Therefore, these designations will be those in mind when reference is made to a biblical text. The city may yield an operational definition only in terms of its locus in the process of urbanization in a given historical moment.

class structure, in particular, the meaning of the עם הארץ, and land tenure within the city. A salient observation appears in the remark that "the deteriorization associated with urbanization is not due to it but to the economic policy of the monarchy". He devotes the remainder of the chapter to an extensive treatment of the urban government, urban specialization and a survey of city-types in the Old Testament.[49]

In the final chapter urbanization and the Israelite valuation of the city are discussed. Frick builds an impressive case against the supposition that Israelite urbanization was preceded by a stage of nomadism or semi-nomadism. He notes that related disciplines have long discontinued the evolutionary framework of the nineteenth century; why should biblical scholars persist?[50] His analysis of urbanization under the monarchy provides the conclusion that "fostered by royal policy [it] spawns anti-centralization reaction in certain strata of the population".[51]

When he addresses himself to the text of Genesis 4:1-26 he casts a weak beam on the meaning of Cain's city-building; he notes a) that it is man's first

---

49 Although chapter two describes in detail the forms of organization it does not integrate the behavior of their functions, i.e., the sum of their relationships to other aspects of society. The hiatus between a form and its function appears frequently whether this is designedly so or not is unclear.

50 Ibid., p. 213ff.

51 Ibid., p. 230. For example, long-distance trade favors the elite, ghettoes are health hazards, migrants to the city will still have rural roots, urban manufacturing overwhelms handcrafts, city regulation of commerce throttles peasant-barter, each class clings to its values even within the city; these are some roots of anti-urban sentiment also.

attempt to provide security for himself contrary to God's decree and away from his presence, b) that Cain builds his own city so as to escape the divinely ordained blood revenge, and c) that Cain's city is a foreign city, i.e., outside of Canaan and therefore Cain is expelled from the tribal structure. Pre-prophetic anti-urbanism is concluded with a look at Babel, however, the remarks of the commentaries are exhumed and no new arrangement given. Frick completes his study with a lengthy survey of prophetic literature prior to the exile.[52]

It is this final section which supplies the only undergirding concept that arises from the biblical text to shed light on the meaning the city had for either the Israelites before or during the monarchy, for either the upper or lower class strata, in either the oral or written traditions. The thesis seems to be a re-lecture as Sjoberg had alluded, not only with sociological presumptions but also prophetic ones.

Coherency in a study of the city spanning eight centuries should not be expected because of the nature of the city itself. It is always in flux; its only alternatives are atrophy, stagnation and ultimately extinction. Yet the canvas Frick has covered with carefully selected and transmitted urban forms does not exceed the unidimensional. The census of variant meanings for the word city at the close of chapter one remain related to the functional

---

52 Pre-prophetic anti-urbanism is dealt with in five pages; prophetic anti-urbanism in twenty-eight. The impression received is that the "Israelite valuation of the city" was gleaned from the prophetic texts and has channelled the author's description of all other appearances of urban phenomena in the Historical Books.

shift the city underwent in time. Notwithstanding these few weaknesses Frick's work has contributed several significant points. 1.) The rural-urban dichotomy is largely a fiction of out-moded sociological theory. 2.) The Israelite society was segmented into an elite which comprised the substance of the population that engaged in the religious, governmental, and educational phases of urban living, and a lower class whose subclasses included an often impoverished urban group and a rural peasantry under the control of the city authorities. 3.) With the advent of the monarchy the basic political unit became the city, replacing the former tribal unit. 4.) Nomadic intrusion is no longer an adequate model to explain the complex of relationships between the tribal groups and urban society.[53] 5.) Frick writes that "urbanization is a function of social organization in that urban growth is highly correlated to the consolidation or extension of a political apparatus", viz., "the rise of cities is due more to a change in a man's interaction with his fellowmen than with his environment".[54] Therefore urbanization was fostered by royal policies; preprophetic anti-urban biblical texts should be read as a "coming to terms with the earlier inhabitants of the land than conquest".[55] And finally, the prophets see the city as man's attempt to provide himself with security without Yahweh's help; yet in itself

---

[53] It is largely for the same reasons produced by Frick in his work and alluded to elsewhere in this thesis that the analysis of Eissfeldt and Fohrer regarding an L or N source on the basis of the supposed nomadic content, that this author rejects their partitioning of the J corpus in that manner.

[54] Frick, The City, p. 229.

[55] Ibid., p. 223.

the city has no value of its own, it is an instrument in Yahweh's power.

CHAPTER TWO

NEAR EASTERN URBAN CIVILIZATIONS PRIOR TO THE DAVIDIC MONARCHY

A. MESOPOTAMIA

The dynamics of a civilization are related to two historical aspects which constitute the individuality of a given civilization according to Henri Frankfort, viz. its identity and the change it undergoes.[1] Having applied this thesis to the civilizations of Mesopotamia and Egypt, he concluded that the former's elusive identity which was never destroyed but did change in the course of times was urban in form.[2] Egypt on the other hand exhibits a continuing indifference to the city long after it had been flourishing in Mesopotamia. The form of civilization found in Egypt in the early and middle kingdoms (while cities did exist in the new kingdom one may safely say they did not alter the form) is contained in the institution of the Egyptian kingship. All the land and its inhabitants were members of the royal household and functioned in society

---

1 H. Frankfort, The Birth of Civilization in the Near East, (Garden City, 1956), p. 2ff. Hereafter cited as: Frankfort, The Birth of Civilization. Cf. also, G. Barton, "The Origins of Civilization in Africa and Mesopotamia, their Relative Antiquity and Interplay," The American Philosophical Society's Proceedings, 68 (1929), pp. 303-312.

2 Ibid., p. 52. In speaking of the period in which writing began Frankfort states: "Now one may say that the birth of Mesopotamian civilization, like its subsequent growth, occurred under the sign of the city". Cf. also, S. Kramer, The Sumerians, (Chicago, 1963), p. 73; R. McC. Adams, The Uruk Countryside: The Natural Setting of Urban Societies, (Chicago, 1972), pp. 1-94.

with respect to this role.[3]

Stratigraphy reveals that the pre-Sumerians in Mesopotamia possessed a culture or cultures (if one assigns fine pottery, permanent houses and the introduction of irrigation to the Hassuna culture circa 7000-5000 B. C., and the era of specialization in writing and various trade skills to the Halafian culture); the best identified perhaps is the Ubaidian. This would place the cities well in existence by the fourth millenium in Mesopotamia regardless of what date one may wish to give to the earliest city. In Egypt the broad span from Gerzean (circa 3200 B. C.) to and including the first two dynasties (down to 2600 B. C.) seems to mark the emergence of the city, although as a dynamic it always remained ancillary to the kingship.

The perplexing question of what accounts for the rise of an urban civilization, or, much more modestly, an urban settlement, has engendered not a few noteworthy hypotheses. Consistent with his "urban revolution" theory, V. Gordon Childe sought to explain Mesopotamian urbanization in terms of a cumulative growth in technology. Long prior to the appearance of the city there occurred the "agricultural revolution" wherein wheat, barley and other cereals were domesticated to stabilize subsistence requirements. Gradually sheep, goats, cattle, and pigs were also included so that lags in diet and seasons would be bridged. This revolution was a process as much

---

3 Frankfort, The Birth of Civilization, pp. 93-94. The Memphite theology relates the theory of the kingship to the significance of the city.

as the urban revolution was, and not by any means an event.[4]

Such a stable and manipulable yield had repercussions in the social relations among the agriculturalists. Since the demands were discontinuous but regular the farmer had leisure time in which to develop other skills, manual or not. Organized cultivation by an aggregate of people held even greater rewards in terms of surplus, specialization of labor, and accumulation of capital in the form of goods or power. In Mesopotamia the shortages of water limit the land that can be cultivated, therefore, cultivation has always been extensive rather than intensive; increased power swelled

---

4 Many important studies deal with the transition from small group living to urban settlements; most useful are: R. Braidwood and G. Howe, Prehistoric Investigations in Iraqi Kurdistan, (Chicago, 1960), p. 184. R. Braidwood, "Southwest Asia Beyond the Lands of the Mediterranean Littoral," Courses Toward Urban Life, ed. R. Braidwood and G. R. Willey, (Chicago, 1962), pp. 132-146. R. and L. Braidwood, "Earliest Village Communities of Southwestern Asia," Journal of World History I, (1954), pp. 278-310. R. McC. Adams, Developmental Studies in Ancient Mesopotamia, Pan-American Union, Social Science Monographs, Vol. I, 1955, pp. 6-18. V. M. Masson, "The Urban Revolution in South Turkmenia," Antiquity, 42 (1968), pp. 178-187. A. Falkenstein, "The Prehistory and Protohistory of Western Asia," in The Near East: The Early Civilizations, eds. J. Bottero, E. Cassin, J. Vercoutter, (New York, 1967), pp. 1-52. Other essays in this volume will be cited hereafter by author, title and the abbreviation, NE:EC. M. Hammond, The City in the Ancient World, Harvard Studies in Urban History, (Cambridge, Mass., 1972), pp. 13-56. C. J. Gadd, The Cities of Babylonia, CAH, Vol. I, Pt. 2, ch. 13, pp. 93-144. K. V. Flannery, "The Origins of the Village as a Settlement Type in Mesoamerica and the Near East: A Comparative Study," in Man, Settlement and Urbanism, (London, 1972), pp. 23-54. Other essays in this volume will be cited hereafter by author, title and the abbreviation, MSU. J. Oates, "Prehistoric Settlement Patterns in Mesopotamia," MSU, pp. 299-310. H. E. W. Crawford, "Stimuli Towards Urbanization in South Mesopotamia," MSU, pp. 761-762.

through a growing population density, did not necessarily precede the core processes of the urban revolution. A lingering question for Childe's equation of material advance and the rise of civilization is: does such a food surplus precipitate the ideologies and institutional contexts that are required to mobilize that surplus? Or is there any intrinsic necessity present that would force farmers to maximize their production which in turn would create a fortiori an elite free from food production? Apparently Childe had assumed as much while not stating so directly.[5]

If writing is taken as the key in judging a settlement as urban, as Childe insisted, then the objection that food surplus does not in itself spell urbanization (because our knowledge of both the existence of it and its bulk derive from written accounts already vested with an institutional setting) becomes cogent. Without the institution and its collective symbols, there is insufficient motivation for agricultural surplus to sweep on towards

---

5 V.G. Childe, What Happened in History, (Harmondsworth, 1942), pp. 97-120. Cf. also, R. McC. Adams, The Evolution of Urban Society: Early Mesopotamia and Prehispanic Mexico, (Chicago, 1964), pp. 38-78; also, Adams, "The Evolutionary Process in Early Civilizations," in Evolution After Darwin II: The Evolution of Man, (Chicago, 1960), pp. 153-168. E.A. Speiser, "Mesopotamia, Evolution of an Integrated Civilization," WHJP, Vol. 1 pp. 173-266. Studies dealing with Childe's indices of urban revolution are: T.C. Young Jr., "Population Densities and Early Mesopotamian Urbanism," MSU, pp. 827-842; B.G. Trigger, "Determinants of Urban Growth in Pre-Industrial Societies," MSU, pp. 575-600. A.D. Kilmer proposes to interpret the Atra-Hasis Epic as the Mesopotamian commentary on overpopulation and its theological solution, viz., fertility is a gift of the Gods, barrenness the natural state, "The Mesopotamian Concept of Overpopulation and its Solution as Reflected in the Mythology," Orientalia 41(1972), pp. 160-177.

XUM

urbanization.[6] The surplus beyond subsistence needs is socially defined (biologically defined it would have no social purpose, multiplying profusely it would be its own cause), viz., the society in some manner has set these quantities aside and declared them to be available for a specific purpose, e.g., ceremonial feasts, future famines, war parties. Such a surplus presupposes an organization which disposes of the surplus, thus the surplus is not the material cause of the elite but the elite may very well be the formal cause of the surplus, as it may have been in the case of Solomon.

The advent of writing occurs within an institutional framework. In Mesopotamia, Frankfort has described the earliest cities as theocratic in nature. The temple-community regulated the social, economic, political, and religious spheres of life with a breadth of control that in non-religious terms would be tyranny but in ancient ideology would be religious obedience. Hence, religion and politics may be said to be reciprocals. Each urban center had its patron god who was the real ruler of the city; the lands and temple were his estate and manor. The administration of the estate fell to the priests; the need for a conventional method of reckoning stores from season to season was met by the discovery of cuneiform writing. Frankfort states: "The political unit was the city; the economic-

---

6 K. Polanyi, C. M. Arensberg, and H. W. Pearson, Trade and Market in the Early Empires, (Glencoe, 1957), pp. 320-341. Polanyi convincingly demonstrates the point that community needs precede food surplus production. The provisions for Solomon's table (I Kgs. 4:22-23) presupposes an extraordinary surplus, efficiently managed from field to board.

religious unit was the temple-community".[7] It is in the temple archives that writings were found which record not only the physical substance of the city but also its spiritual suppositum.[8]

While Childe and Sjoberg wish to equate the use of writing

---

7 Frankfort, The Birth of Civilization, p. 64. Cf. also R. McC. Adams, "Patterns of Urbanization in Early Southern Mesopotamia," MSU, pp. 735-750; idem, Level and Trend in Early Sumerian Civilization, (unpublished doctoral thesis), University of Chicago, 1956, 223 p.

8 The physical aspect of the ancient Mesopotamian city has been profusely described in a growing number of works to which the reader is referred: V. G. Childe, "The Urban Revolution in Mesopotamia," ch. 5 in What Happened in History, pp. 89-112; idem, "The Urban Revolution in Mesopotamia," ch. 7 in New Light on the Most Ancient Near East, (New York, 1953), pp. 102-147; A. L. Oppenheim, Ancient Mesopotamia: Portrait of a Dead Civilization, (Chicago, 1964), pp. 74-112; idem, "Mesopotamia: Land of Cities," Pt. I in Middle Eastern Cities, ed. I. Lapidus, (Berkeley, 1969), pp. 3-18; H. Frankfort, "Town Planning in Ancient Mesopotamia," The Town Planning Review, 21 (1950), pp. 98-115; idem, "The Cities of Ancient Mesopotamia," ch. 3 in Birth of Civilization, pp. 49-89. P. Lampl, Cities and Planning in the Ancient Near East, (New York, 1969), 128 p. provides many street and floor plans of the cities. R. McC. Adams, Land Behind Baqdad: A History of Settlement on the Diyala Plain, (Chicago, 1965), 187p. A. J. Jawad, Advent of the Era of Townships, (Leiden, 1966), 128 p. S. N. Kramer, The Sumerians, pp. 73-111. E. Unger, Babylon: Die Heilige Stadt nach der Beschreibung der Babylonier, (Berlin, 1931), 382 p. is old but contains excellent city designs, graphs and maps. L. King, A History of Sumer and Akkad, (London, 1916), 380 p. even older than Unger but a standard in the field and still contains informative illustrations of the cities. These few selections are an introduction to the excellent material available and do not assume to be exhaustive. The social stratification of the Mesopotamian society is another facet too broad to be treated here; however, besides portions of the works cited above, the reader's attention may be directed to A. L. Oppenheim, "A New Look at the Structure of Mesopotamian Society," Journal of the Economic and Social History of the Orient, 10 (1967), pp. 1-16.

XUM

with urbanism in such a unilinear way that cities are postulated in all literate cultures, the present study does not choose to affirm one variable as the key to the passage of a settlement from the non-urban to urban. Instead, it would seem more judicious to speak of such factors as necessary ingredients in the process of urbanization. The Mesopotamian society of the fourth millenium is hierarchical in character; matters concerning productive, administrative, social, religious or military issues are highly organized with respect to function. The temple-community has clearly defined roles and specialized duties for personnel. The size of the urban center tends to vary with the number of functions the personnel perform. A comparison of the personnel lists in II Sam. 7:16-18; 20:23-26; and IKgs. 4:2-6 is instructive with regard to Israel.

In origin, the temple was administered by the community for the community. In return for the cooperation of the community the temple would provide many services such as: care of the local gods, financing and organizing festivals, individual burials, administering oaths and ordeals, even judging perhaps, acting as an emergency granary for the needy, and later as financier of trading markets. Its own wealth accrued originally from gifts and offerings, perishable and non-perishable, but most importantly by land grants from the community. Such a secure source constituted the basis for the developed system of temple estates so frequent in the literature. To administer the temple fields a labor force was necessary; temple slaves were known but did not form a large source; tenant farmers who leased and were taxed plots of arable land made up the bulk of the labor force while some room must be made for the casual worker employed as the need arose.

XUM

By the period of the first dynasty of Ur the temple had assumed the predominant role in the Mesopotamian city. This position it would gradually relinquish to the political order after the third dynasty. Thus only by degrees was there a growing rift between the sacred and the secular community -- but never in the modern sense of the modern chasm between the two.[9]

In the early dynastic (and probably in predynastic as well) times the temple is referred to as the "house of god", an abode in which the god lived. Since the god was considered the king of the city, the temple also became by and large the god's palace, housing his family, servants, guests and, of course, his caretakers, the priests. Thus the functions of the temple already alluded to above, came to assume those of palace administration with courts, storehouses, kitchens, breweries, and stables and the living quarters for the staff. The city-god's vicar supervises the planning and management of the irrigation works, the work force, and even the defense of the god's property in case of attack. This vicar came to have the title of

---

9 This distinction between the place of the temple in early and late dynastic periods is important if one is to understand the shift in emphasis from the position of the established scholars such as Frankfort, Kramer, Oppenheim, Falkenstein, and F. R. Kraus who hold for a predominant role for the temple, and the more recent thinking such as that represented by J. N. Postgate who feels the evidence has been overplayed in favor of the sacred. Cf. J. N. Postgate, "The Temple in the Mesopotamian Secular Community," MSU, pp. 811-825. More recently G. Roux has continued the traditional view of the temple as the working model of organization for the secular in Ancient Iraq, (London, 1964), p. 113.

ensi, or governor of the temple (and eventually of the palace complex as well).[10]

In the course of time the position of the ensi became more and more secularized; he served as the liason between the lugal of the city and the gods of the city.[11] It cannot be determined with certainty if the next step saw the ensi assume greater political power to supplant the city prince or whether the prince assumed a more active role in the temple life, especially the cult, so as to minimize the role of the temple chief. In either case, the two positions seemed to have merged by the third dynasty of Ur. A few Sumerian cities were large enough to support more than one temple-community and it has been suggested that the liaison officer between these communities was the individual designated as ensi. In the famous reform text of Urukagina, an ensi of the city of Lagash, tells how he corrected the abuses of the former ensi. As champion of the gods he re established the freedom of the city people against taxes on burials, weddings, realty frauds, and the land aggrandizement of the king, whose onion and cucumber fields encroached on the best fields of the temple and were tilled by the temple personnel and beasts.

---

10 Frankfort, The Birth of Civilization, pp. 79-80, raises the question as to which meaning may be given the title ensi. The secular leader in Sumer was the lugal or "great man", "king"; the sangu or nubanda was the administrative leader in the temple; ensi seems to combine the duties of both in one office. The numerous duties of the ensi are examined in A. Falkenstein, "La cité-temple sumérienne," Cahiers d'Histoire Mondiale, I (1954), pp. 795-801. Cf. also, D. O. Edzard, "The Early Dynastic Period," NE:EC, pp. 70-84.

11 Childe relates that under Urukagina the city-governor was the high priest of the city god, Ningirsu, and his wife "was high-priestess of Ningirsu's

What is most important in the reform is that it is understood (or assumed) that in the original state of affairs Ningirsu, the patron of Lagash, was the real ruler of the city and that all improprieties must be eradicated by a return to the religious basis of the society. That the reform failed seems to testify how far either the people had moved from the religious basis or how powerful the secular arm remained in the face of the reform.

The size of the temple and the quality of its appointments normally indicated the power of the patron god and his city. While revenues from its fields and the pious offerings of its worshippers sustained the temple, royal largess as time went on provided capital for enlarging and embellishing it if not underwriting the construction of a new temple. Oppenheim sees a direct correlation between the magnitude of temple-palace architecture as a "revealing mirror of the creative aspirations of the period" and the "desires of every powerful ruler" to immortalize himself.[12] The point to be noted here is that the office of ensi held by a man thought to be an equal among his peers entrusted with making decisions that affected all segments of the city and its citizenry had grown into an institution of kingship which "had

---

11 (cont.) consort, Bau." What Happened in History, p. 109. Also, H.W. F. Saggs, The Greatness That Was Babylon, (London, 1962) pp. 349-350. sees no marital relationship between the ensi and the entu, the high priestess.

12 Oppenheim, Ancient Mesopotamia, p. 97. Of interest in this regard is A.S. Kapelrud's important study, "Temple Building, a Task for Gods and Kings," Orientalia, 32 (1963), pp. 56-62. Israelite kingship is never described as having descended from the heavens, yet Saul is deemed a charismatic, and David is empowered by Samuel's anointing as well. David for all his might remained a man among men, one whom Shimei could throw stones at, however, in Solomon a new element is added. He has wisdom from on high. His wisdom was a direct gift from Yahweh at Gibeon. No one might match his knowledge and wisdom. The monarchy came to stand in stark contrast to the egalitarian ideal of the tribal confederacy.

descended from the heavens".[13]

While early temple community plans provide living quarters within the walls for the administrators and their families, e.g., the excavations of The Temple Oval at Khafajah place them between the outer and inner walls, later constructions display a shift to building the residence apart from the temple complex. Adam Falkenstein notes in comparing the palaces of Kish and Eridu from the first dynastic period that they have the architectural characteristics of earlier temples (size, thickness of walls, opulence)

---

13 Kramer, Sumerians, p. 74. Kramer notes that an ensi in later days could be subject to a national ruler, e.g., Sargon, that he had a responsibility to the assembly of "elders". Th. Jacobsen presents the idea that the ensi was chosen from the assembly because of his "administrative abilities, charismatic powers, and magical ability to make things thrive", while another was chosen war leader in times of crises. Cf. Jacobsen, "Early Political Development in Mesopotamia," ZA, 52 (1957), pp. 91-140. Also, the governor differed from the king in that he was permanent, not a temporary official. In the Enuma Elish epic, Marduk is given kingship by a council of the gods, a kingship which in the ideal world was always circumscribed by the council. Cf. H. Frankfort, Kingship and the Gods, (Chicago, 1948), pp. 223-236. The Sumerian King List abruptly begins with the phrase "after kingship had descended from heaven", alluding to the divine origin; again after the Flood, kingship descended a second time. Cf. Th. Jacobsen, The Sumerian King List, Assyriological Studies, No. 11, (Chicago, 1939), p. 58. L. Mumford offers the reflection: "The modest foundations of the village had been laid in the earth: but the city reversed the village's values, and turned the peasant's universe upside down, by placing the foundation in the heavens". Cf. The City in History, (New York, 1961), p. 37. Also, I. Engell, Studies in Divine Kingship, (Oxford, 1967), pp. 16-51. On the democratic or total lack of democratic aspect of the Mesopotamian political structure note G. Evans, "Ancient Mesopotamian Assemblies," JAOS 78 (1958), pp. 1-11; Th. Jacobsen, "Primitive Democracy in Ancient Mesopotamia," JNES 2 (1943), pp. 159-172; K. A. Wittfogel, Oriental Despotism: A Comparative Study in Total Power, (New Haven, 1963), p. 556.

XUM

but are not found within the temple complex. He deduced: "Il est donc permis de conclure que l'apparition de ce palais coincide avec le désir du souverain de s'affranchir du temple."[14] The dual movement of increased distance between himself and the temple precinct on the one hand and the growing assumption of divine status on the other, would seem to indicate that the focus of Mesopotamian city life was being drawn from the more ancient temple-community ideal to a new allegiance, both political and religious, to the king. The citizenry owe the king their fealty directly. The Sumerian religion was incipiently urban and grounded in the original temple-community. Urbanization had drawn away from this ideal to a city with a king and his subjects. With the rise of national kingship and the emergence of a dominant city-state, local gods and their devotees are embraced in the pantheon of the ruling power, Sargon of Akkad and his successor Naram-Sin attempted to solidify their newly won political supremacy by incorporating the Sumerian gods into their own Semitic circle of deities.

In Israel the direction was different. Urbanization was the result of royal policies which drew the people towards the building of a temple. A possible motive for this trend might be that the Mesopotamian pattern showed that a king could ensure himself greater security by controlling the temple ideology.

The Sargon Chronicle begins: "Sargon (Šarru-ken), king of Agade, rose (to power), in the era of Ishtar and had neither rival nor opponent."[15] The enigmatic phrase "era of Ishtar" is the medium whereby the supremacy of Ishtar is proclaimed throughout Sargon's realm. His "holding sway over the totality

---

[14] A. Falkenstein, "La cité-temple sumérienne," p. 799.

[15] ANET, p. 266. Cf. J. Bottéro, "The First Semitic Empire," NE:EC, pp. 91-132.

of the countries" enumerated is due to the protection and succor of Sargon's patroness, the moon-goddess, Ishtar, J. Lewy has concluded that the evidence suggests Ishtar herself has conferred upon the ruling prince the title šarru kiššat mâti, "the king of the totality of the land".[16] In pre-Sargonid days the princes of Ur had appropriated the title for themselves and when the hegemony had passed to non-Sumerians, the title also was transferred. Now it is Sargon who acts in Ishtar's place, or, she through him. While Ur was the capital-city of the south, its ruler invoked Sin, patron of Ur, in these terms: "the merciful and forgiving father who holds the life of all the land in his hand" and "the builder of the country...who chooses kingship (and) bestows the scepter".[17] Lewy understands it as a model prayer transposed for Ishtar when the "era of Ishtar" would be in ascendency throughout Sumer and Akkad. The importance of this lies in the fact that while religious and political institutions had undergone massive changes from the proto-literate period to the third dynasty of Ur, religion was still

---

16 J. Lewy, "The Assyro-Babylonian Cult of the Moon and Its Culmination in the Time of Nabonidus," HUCA 19 (1946), pp. 480-481. Also, W.F. Albright, "Gilgames and Engidu, Mesopotamian Genii of Fecundity," JAOS, 40 (1920), p. 308, draws attention to the fact that Gilgamesh is recorded as the fifth king of the "dynasty of Eanna", the title of the ziggurat at Erech, the house of the heaven God, An, the patron god of Erech. Cf. also, E. Douglas Van Buren, "Homage to a Deified King," ZA, 16 (1952), pp. 92-120. E.A.Speiser, "Authority and Law in Mesopotamia," JAOS Supplement, 17 (1954), pp. 8-15, underscores the king's subservience to the gods, his source of power. In I Kgs. 4 Solomon is described as "king as far as the Euphrates"; he rules by a wisdom directly given him by his patron, Yahweh.

17 ANET, p. 385. The text is preserved in both Sumerian and Akkadian; it is a copy from the reign of Ashurbanipal (668-633 B.C.) of an older text whose original date cannot be determined.

urban in character, and gods indigenous to a particular temple and city had become dominant and national yet rooted in the city now the capital. In Israel, Yahweh becomes nationalized under the united monarchy. Solomon does not construct a pantheon but he does build a house for his patron and shrines for the gods of his wives. In Mesopotamia, individuals had a place in society because they belonged to a city which had now become part of a larger whole, whose framework was still the city.[18] The gods had dwelt in the cities in the early days; the Sumerian community had evolved in them and ultimately gave the form to its entire civilization.[19]

Oppenheim has expressed the belief that ancient Mesopotamia has left scant evidence of an anti-urban bias.[20] However, a closer review of the literature seems to expose veins of a tension which is not a literary fiction. The Gilgamesh cycle of sagas and the Epic of Irra furnish some intriguing insights into this tension the scribe reflects. Lugalbanda, the shepherd, ruled Erech 1,200 years as successor to Enmerkar the city's founder, in

---

18 F.R. Kraus, "Le Rôle des Temples depuis la Troisième Dynastie d'Ur jusqu 'à la Première Dynastie de Babylone," Cahiers d'Histoire Mondiale, I (1954), pp. 518-545.

19 Oppenheim, Ancient Mesopotamia, p. 111. He agrees with this thought in the statement: "...attitude is one of unconditional acceptance of the city as the one and only communal organization". But he immediately goes on to say that anti-urban passages of the Old Testament are echoes of a nomadic past, which in itself echoes nineteenth century sociological theory.

20 Ibid., p. 110. Cf. also, Oppenheim, Middle Eastern Cities. p. 7, "As for the spirit of the Mesopotamian city, the citizens completely accepted urban life. Literary texts reveal scarcely any resentment toward the city..."

the Sumerian King List.[21] He is succeeded by Dumuzi, the fisherman and then the "divine Gilgamesh", whose father may have been a nomad, a priest of Kullab, a lillû (fool, foolish lout), or a divinity of Kullab. In truth there are two cycles of stories, the Lugalbanda cycle and the Gilgamesh-Enkidu cycle.

Gilgamesh was the son of Ninsun, goddess of Erech and consort of the god Lugalbanda, and Â, the priest of Kullab; the hero was said to be two thirds divine and one third mortal in the Epic of Gilgamesh. He retained his affiliation with Kullab as the Epic opens with his title, "Lord of Kullab", and attributes to him the building of Uruk's walls and the temple of An and Ishtar. Thus from its inception the Epic reveals that Gilgamesh was divine-mortal, but the suspense of the saga finds its spring in his human nature. Albright has remarked that if one turns "to consider the original nature of Gilgames, his solar characteristics become immediately apparent".[21a] He is a judge of the Annanaki; he possesses the powers of Shamash, the sun-god, and at the same time he is the "lord of the underworld". But prior to Gilgamesh, Lugalbanda, another divine-mortal, ruled Uruk. Lugalbanda is the son of Shamash by the daughter of Enmerkar. According to legend, he was thrown from the tower immediately upon birth, caught in the wings of a passing eagle, given to the care of a gardener, and passed his youth as a shepherd before inventing the throne.

---

[21] ANET, p. 266.

[21a] Albright, JAOS, 40 (1920), p. 310.

Enmerkar was a mighty king ruling in Kullab; Lugalbanda with his consort Ninsun ruled as god in Marad and Tupliaš in eastern Babylonia; their cult is found also at Lagash and Nippur. In the story of Lugalbanda and Zû, the sun-god outwits the storm-god Zû with the help of the wine-goddess Ninkasi-Siris on Mount Sâbu. The Lugalbanda adventure is thematically similar to Gilgamesh's visit to the temptress, Sâbîtu, but Gilgamesh must go beyond the wine-goddess to see Utnapishtim who will have the answer to the secret of immortality. Lugalbanda recovers the tablets of fate; Gilgamesh discovers the plant of life. Albright suggests that Gilgamesh was revered as a god of fertility; in fact he explains the original name Giš-gibil-gan-mes as "the hero who fecundates with the torch of fertility".[22]

Then Gilgamesh may be viewed as a vegetation god and just as the plants over which he rules must die so also in the epic, must his quest for eternal life end in failure. On a similar note Albright has traced an argument that Enkidu, the wild man of the epic was identified with Gira-Šakan-Sumuqan, patrons of the gazelle or gods of animal fertility. The name Enkidu may be rendered "Lord of the Underworld" and thus relates to Enki, the god of water and of wisdom. The epic describes him as dressed "in a garment like Sumugan" the cattle god who becomes the principle of male virility, the mana residing in the male. Enkidu is said by Gilgamesh to be his friend "who chased the wild ass of the hills, the panther of the steppes".[23] The Mesopotamian cult of the ass

---

[22] W. F. Albright, op. cit., pp. 316-318.

[23] ANET, p. 91.

centers on the god Šakan, frequently associated with Sumugan; likewise the lion god, Gira (Sumerian ùg or gìr) is found in conjunction with Enkidu in the passage. Nergal the popular figure of several myths is a lion-god and underworld god, specifically under the title Irra, the plague god. In short, Enkidu is the master of these gods - and yet he dies. This is the enigma Gilgamesh cannot solve. The epic associates Gilgamesh, the historische and geschichtliche, with the city of Uruk, symbol of the civilized. Enkidu, redolent of mythical fertility also, is led from love of animals, to love of a woman, to love of a friend; he has been civilized and suffers civilization's poison, death. The hierodule as an extension of Ishtar brings Enkidu to know what it is to be a man, to be "wise".[24]

The citizens of Uruk welcome the "wise" Enkidu who has vowed to change the old order. He thwarts Gilgamesh entering the door of Ishbara (Ishtar) and the fierce combat follows. Their friendship ensues and they pass many adventures together until Enkidu slays the Bull of Heaven (a drought on the productive land) and insults Ishtar to her face. Now Enkidu must reside in the nether world, forever separated from Gilgamesh.

Much has been made of the rustic Enkidu as opposed to the urban Gilgamesh as a clash of opposites. The taming of Enkidu and the sapping of his life-energy, caused by contact with civilization, his estrangement from what was connatural, his loss of innocence, and above all his fatal contact with Ishtar (recall the litany of treachery Gilgamesh recites to Ishtar that has befallen all who accept her arts de la fille de joie) seem to

---

[24] ANET, p. 75.

imply a preference for the non-urban way of life. But a review of the mythical lives of the two protagonists reveals a near consanguinity of the pair as fertility gods that overides the supposed motif of the rural-urban dichotomy. Enkidu never really becomes a vehicle of protest for the anti-urban remonstrators. Yet he does expose a side which may very well be related to the city-countryside motif.[25]

The lexical and literary evidence for the contrast between what is urban and what is other is patent in the Epic of Irra, god of pestilence.[26] The god is urged by the divine Seven to destroy Babylon in these words:

> Arise, get up!
> Are you going to dwell in the city like a
> paralyzed old man?
> Are you going to dwell in the house like a
> feeble baby?
> Are we to eat women's bread like one who
> will not take the field?
> Are we to fear and tremble as if we did not
> know battle?
> Taking to the field of manhood is like a
> holiday!
> The city dweller, though he be a prince,
> can never eat enough
> He is despised and slandered in the talk
> of his own people
> How is he to match his strength with him
> who takes the field?
> Let the prowess of the city-dweller be ever
> so enormous -

---

[25] Oppenheim, Ancient Mesopotamia, p. 261. He remarks "One can easily detect in the praise of the joys of civilized living in Uruk and the idyllic descriptions of the shepherds and their way of life the expression of a relationship between city and open country that is unique in Mesopotamia".

[26] S. Langdon, Mythology of All Races: Vol. IV; Semitic. (Boston, 1931), pp. 137-148. The text is given in part with a commentary. The full text is in L. Cagni, L'Epopea di Erra. Studi Semitici, 34 (Rome, 1969).

How is he to overpower the one who takes the field?
The finest city food cannot compare with field rations
The sweetest light beer cannot compare with water from the goatskin
The palace (erected on) a high terrace cannot compare with the (warrio)r's pallet
Warlike Irra, take the field, brandish your weapons.[27]

The perspective is that of Irra the warrior urging her chariots to attack the city of Babylon. The Spartan-like warrior is better fit than the pampered city-dweller. The contrast therefore is not between the rural and the urban but between the hardy life of the field and that of the city. The Seven Sages who urge Irra on are the seven dreadful weapons of Irra given her by An and to be distinguished from the seven wise ones that Marduk will later accuse Irra of having kidnapped. The poem implies that Marduk had saved seven antediluvian kings from Irra's Flood of long ago by hiding them in Apsu. These seven are assigned the cities of Ur, Nippur, Eridu, Kullab, Kish, Lagash, and Shuruppak and they are said to have written down the secrets of divination, all magical arts, and wisdom.[28]

---

[27] W. W. Hallo, "Antediluvian Cities," JCS, 23 (1971), p. 57. The text translation quoted is that of Hallo. One might note the reappearance of the Seven Sages who laid the foundations of Uruk's wall, and who had in legend brought civilization to Mesopotamia's seven oldest cities.

[28] Langdon, Mythology, p. 140. Cf. Also E. Reiner, "The Etiological Myth of the "Seven Sages," Orientalia 30 (1961), pp. 1-11, in which the apkallu tradition is examined with the note that although there is some basis for viewing the antediluvian sages and kings as one and the same, there is equal weight with the opinion that the motif of the "wise vizier" may exist in its own right. Recall Joseph in the Yahwist saga.

Of interest here are two items: 1) Irra does not destroy the city because it is a symbol and locus of corruption as Sodom and Gomorrah of Hebrew scriptures, and 2) the seven wise men do not urge Irra to unleash terror on the city, the divine seven who do, are Irra's weapons of pestilence. The latter is important in dispelling the temptation to see in the seven wise men a diatribe against civilization.[29]

There is a sharp contrast between Sumerian and Hebrew lexicography regarding the city. In Sumerian the word is uru (Akkadian âlu) and ostensibly has no synonyms save tir ("forest") which is properly Hittite and does not qualify.[30] Hebrew uses several: 1) עיר is only word for city, 2) מחוז an Assyrian loan word found only in Ps. 107:30, 3) קריה a poetic synonym that occurs but once in the Tetrateuch (Nbs. 21:28 E), 4) קרה found only in wisdom literature (Job 29:7, Pr. 8:3; 9:3, 14; 11:11).[31]

---

[29] Mention must be made also of specific reasons given Irra for razing Uruk. Note the similarity of line with the Gilgamesh Epic VI: 165-166 (ANET, p. 85) as Ishtar summons her harlots. "In Uruk, abode of Anu and Ishtar, city of hierdules, whores and courtesans, for whom Ishtar paid a husband and counted him as theirs, where bedouin men and women utter cries, (and) eunuchs and eunuch-singers are summoned to Eanna, whose virility Ishtar turned to effeminacy to terrify the people..." Langdon, Mythology, p. 143.

[30] Cf. A. L. Oppenheim, The Assyrian Dictionary Vol. I. (Glückstadt, 1963), pp. 379-388.

[31] F. Brown, S. R. Driver, and C. A. Briggs, Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament, (Boston, 1966). Hereafter cited as: B-D-B. Cf. also G. Lisowsky, Konkordanz zum Hebräischen Alten Testament, 2nd ed. (Stuttgart, 1958). Hereafter cited as KHAT. R. Eisler, "Loan words in Semitic Languages meaning "town", Antiquity 13 (1939), 449-455, identifies the Hebrew ir(u) with Sumerian uru.

The Sumerian employs many words for the countryside Â-dam, a-ri-a, ê-ri-a (that which is fructified with water); ê-duru (the moistened ground); a-gâr (the water pocket). Â-dam probably signified "pasture", "meadow", "grazing land". In all, the Sumerian believes that the land outside the city was a "corona" within the jurisdiction of the city and therefore very much in harmony with it.[32] Hebrew has few synonyms for the countryside: מגרש which is common land or pasture-land on the outskirts of the city, אחזה land possessed by inheritance and arable, דבר a pasture for a (sheep) flock, מדבר, a steppe or desert.[33] Hallo concludes that on the one side Sumerian usage indicates "diffuse, subjective, functional diversity of descriptive terms for the countryside, reflecting the urban point of view and a succession of different linguistic strata"; while on the other hand the word, city reflects "a basic common distinctiveness that apparently outweighed whatever external differences divided the cities of one age or place from another."[34] The corollary that Hebrew usage indicates that the countryside was more their home by reason of the paucity of synonyms for it and the multiplicity of synonyms available for the concept of city cannot

---

[32] Hallo, op. cit. p. 59. Cf. also, A.O. Haldar, The Notion of the Desert in the Sumero-Akkadian and West Semitic Religions (Uppsala, 1950), pp. 14-35, introduces ערל=steppe, "Nether World," in Sumerian and שממה i.e. ישימון for desert in Hebrew. In agreement with Pedersen, he equates desert with a place of demonic rule in the ritual texts.

[33] BDB, KHAT. Cf. Also, M.Haran, "Studies in the account of the Levitical Cities I: Utopia and Historical Reality," JBL 80 (1961), pp. 45-54.

[34] Hallo, op. cit., p. 59.

be established. Heed must be paid to the linguistic strata in which the Hebrew word is located; in the main, עיר is found in the early as well as late, no other synonym save a derivative of קריה in conjunction with a specific city is found early; מגרש, אחזה are late and usually found only in P.

The seven sages linked with antediluvian cities (cf. supra) were also linked with Eridu as early as the Old Babylonian period as may be seen from the Hymn for Šu'ara.[35] The association of sages and cities with antediluvian kings brings the circle full round. Finkelstein has demonstrated the unanimity among the texts as to the number, names and sequences of the antediluvian cities as he also shows the lack of unanimity among the kings in number, name and sequence.[36] The biblical authors seem far more concerned with preserving traditions of antediluvian figures rather than any geographical center. How vague is Eden, east of Eden, land of Nod! Further attention must be given to the relations between the Mesopotamian traditions of antediluvian genealogies of sages and kings, and cities with the biblical Kenite and Sethite genealogies of Genesis 4. In fact the Sumerian King List might be amended to read the Sumerian City List because it begins with Eridu's creation and closes with Isin's destruction, i.e., it records the primeval history of "the city".[37]

---

[35] Ibid., p. 62.

[36] J. J. Finkelstein, "The Antediluvian Kings: A University of California Tablet," JCS 17 (1963), pp. 45-51.

[37] Hallo, op. cit., p. 66.

Summary

Before turning to the Egyptian attitude toward the city, a glance back at the salient features found in Mesopotamian urbanism might be recalled. The cities arose in Mesopotamia by the fourth millenium for a passel of reasons whose causal relationship is still the point of continued research. An operant hypothesis drawn from the available evidence of archaeology and literary records would see cities form when: 1) there would exist a surplus of food produced by a group of people living in close proximity and 2) sufficiently motivated by existing religious institutions to distribute equitably the surplus among the populace according to needs and group values. The original urban model of community life evolved from the temple complex which was superseded by a political apparatus spanning multiples of temple communities to form a city-state. The urban-religious form of the group was expanded and modified in the course of time as one city-state became so dominant as to be termed an empire. The dominant cultural form was the city which continuously functioned as the social unit and religious expression of the Mesopotamian self-concept. Men were adventitious creations of the gods whose purpose was to serve the gods. The service dictated a social form not based on kinship but territory, the city and its corona; the origin of men prevented even the most powerful from ever assuming divinity, consequently the ruler always remained the vicar of the gods.[38] While abuses concomitant with urban life-existed, remedies drew upon urban

---

[38] E. A. Speiser, "The Manner of the King," WHJP, III. p. 283, states that there are two checks on the king: 1) the assembly and, 2) the gods in whose place he rules.

ideology to cure them. Internecine feuds did develop, but they did not rupture the urban mold in their resolution. And finally it must be said that the rural-urban dichotomy of modern literature is not reflected in that of ancient Mesopotamia.

B. EGYPT

That there were genuine cities in Egypt prior to the Eighteenth Dynasty is a moot point among Egyptologists. The Egyptian city arose centuries after its counterpart in Mesopotamia; it lacked defensive ramparts; it never became a focal point to rally political factions; it never superceded in importance the "city of the dead" to which it was adjoined. Wilson and Edgerton have protested that hard data about Pharaonic Egypt in terms of written records (papyrus may be burned, rot when damp, or be devoured by termites while Mesopotamian clay is far more durable) or building complexes beyond the monumental (Egyptian mud brick houses disintegrated in flood time or are presently buried in the centuries of alluvium) are not at hand.[39] What evidence there is of the living cities is faint and evanescent and does not permit one to speak of the city with the same confidence (nor model) as in Mesopotamia.

The kings of Egypt, beginning with Menes at Memphis, built a capital city wherever they resided and frequently it was also their tomb-site. The term city

---

[39] J. A. Wilson, "Civilization without Cities" in The City Invincible: A Symposium on Urbanization and Cultural Development in the Ancient Near East, ed. R. Adams and C. Kraeling, (Chicago, 1960), pp. 125-165.

should perhaps be restricted to reveal sites which contained: a) a royal residence, b) royal shrine, c) royal tomb-site nearby, d) adequate facilities to house the work force necessary to complete his tomb, his army, and shelter his royal staff. Other metropolitan sites may be called "towns" which were the capitals of nomes governed by nomarchs, the king's administrative leaders in political and geographical districts, or by extension to lesser administrators in outlying ports or frontier posts. And finally, the term "village" may designate the agricultural settlements that dot the arable land whatever their density.

Frankfort has gone so far as to repudiate the assumption that Egyptians had a sense of history because "they conceived their world as essentially static and unchanging. It had gone forth complete from the hands of the Creator. Historical incidents were, consequently, no more than superficial disturbances of the established order, or recurring events of never-changing significance."[40] Childe's urban revolution is based on the notion of progressive change; cities appear as the effect of a multitude of historical causes. It is not that Egypt lacked development; it is that she did not view the changes as progress; there was no faculty of historical self-consciousness due in large

---

[40] Frankfort, The Birth of Civilization, p. 9. Frankfort disagress strenuously with Spengler's romantic view that the "Egyptian soul" was pre-eminently history-oriented.

measure to her theory of kingship.[41] The fact that Egyptian farming villages did attain a modest surplus of food, did conduct commerce in the riverine ribbon, did produce monumental architecture, writing, and representational art, but did not evolve into numerous well-defined cities places inordinate stress on Childe's theory of urban centers. Specialization of craftsmen is well attested archaeologically and population density is a safe assumption if mortuary clues are accepted.

Egyptian civilization has some points in common with Redfield's "folk society" but many glaring differences also.[42] Throughout its history Egypt was always agrarian in base, underwent increasing secularization but the sacred remained the controlling element. In pre-dynastic times Egyptians experimented in animal breeding, architecture and art.[43] Fixation in these

---

[41] The Egyptian king was the god Horus incarnate, upon death he became Osiris who was resurrected as his son Horus in the person of the new king. The god-king was the state and source of all power both social and natural. Consequently, the city was never a phenomenon independent of the all-pervading presence and control of the divine king.

[42] The folk society is non-literate, small, isolated, "and homogeneous, with a strong sense of group solidarity. The ways of living are conventionalized into that coherent system which we call a 'culture'. Behavior is traditional, spontaneous, uncritical, and personal; there is no legislation or habit of experiment and reflection for intellectual ends. Kinship, its relationships and institutions are the type categories of experience and the familial group is the unit of action. The sacred prevails over the secular; the economy is one of status rather than of market". R. Redfield, "The Folk Society," AJS, 52 (1947), p. 293.

[43] R. A. Parker suggests that Egyptian civilization may have originated from animal husbandry economy in contrast to a cereal base in Mesopotamia. Cf. Wilson, The City Invincible, p. 136-137. Also, Wilson, The Burden of Egypt, (Chicago, 1951), p. 35.

XUM

fields was consequent to the religious dogma ossifying and setting its disapproval on deviations from the traditional, thus the creative and seminal period in Egyptian culture occurred at the beginning and not in cycles or waves as elsewhere. The literature does not reveal a local solidarity or consciousness over and against outsiders; on the contrary, once the Upper and Lower Lands were one all were Egyptian from the Mediterranean littoral to at least 600 miles south of the Delta.

A further peculiar aspect of Egyptian civilization is that its central institution, the kingship, bursts on the scene, complete with administrative know-how, ideology, and without opposition. Thus a nation abruptly appears around 3000 B. C. unannounced. The lock step paradigm of city, city-state, nation dear to Toynbee does not surface in the Nile valley. Helen Kantor is less pessimistic about the information pre-dynastic potsherds reveal; evidence from the Gerzean period presage symbols later Pharaohs would employ to signify their power.[44]

The unification of the Two Lands did not lead to a concentration of social activity in urban centers; instead a royal bureaucracy developed which witnessed three factions gain a balance of power: the palace with its army, the priesthood and its mythology, the civil service and its control of government operations. Mumford artfully contends that all of Egypt may be regarded as a city. The desert and mountains flanking the Nile within a few miles to the east and west form the defensive walls of the city: the administrative

---

[44]Wilson, The City Invincible, p. 155.

homes and totemic groups comprise the "neighborhoods" of the city; the Pharaoh's tomb would stand for the inner haven, the citadel of the city.[45] The king and his royal staff become the urban head and its administration; the minute details reaching remote nomes and touching the lives of every peasant yearly give credence to the assertion that the dynasty regarded itslef less as a spindly nation than as an elongated city.

Mumford believes that the walled city was an early form in Egypt that disappeared after the rise of the Pharaohs.[46] The religious belief that universal order was maintained through the king, that political unity was a reality, evoked a response of voluntary support from the populace. This idea receives support from Wilson's observation that during the early dynasties Egypt was isolated and secure. The shock of the Hyksos invasion and rule deflated the Egyptian sense of superiority, reversed the underlying psychology of self-assured immortality; and engendered anxiety and peril. The state becomes disciplined; contacts with outsiders become limited and

---

[45] Mumford, The City in History, pp. 79-84. He regards all of Egypt as the "open city", yet individual towns remain as such. Perhaps the Mayan civilization of the Yucatan is analogous as a civilization without the formal container of the city.

[46] The hieroglyphic ideogram for the word newt "city, town" shows an oval enclosure with axial lines. Mumford sees in this evidence of the early form of the Egyptian city, viz., as walled oval enclosure. Mumford, The City in History, p. 81. Against this H. S. Smith, "Society and Settlement in Ancient Egypt," MSU, p. 717 argues that an oval temple platform at Hierakonopolis from 3200-2600 B. C. is the only archaeological data to buttress such a notion, hardly adequate for plausibility.

XUM

guarded, and at Tell-el-Amarna a fortified city is built in the 14th century.

This factor leads to the intriguing possibility that the impulse to construct cities in the classic Mesopotamian fashion came during the Hyksos rule and not as a reaction to it. Van Seters had traced the Hyksos to a movement of Semitic groups through Syria-Palestine into Egypt during the Middle Bronze period.[47] The city-state pattern had been well established in Syria-Palestine by this time and would be familiar to them. It would be misleading to assume from this conjecture that the Hyksos were harbingers of a city-building culture. They founded the city of Avaris-Tanis in the Delta as a fortified camp. Similar structures, perhaps military posts, can be located as far south as Middle Egypt. Thebes remained the seat of a tribute-paying Pharaoh throughout this period. Aside from Avaris-Tanis they constructed no major city.[48]

The Hyksos milked the Egyptians with exacting taxes, lived apart from the natives, disregarded the temples of the gods and disdained Egyptian culture with arrogance. They brought with them the horse and chariot,

---

[47] J. Van Seters, The Hyksos, (New Haven, 1966), pp. 38-48.

[48] Josephus in his own historical style relates from the Ptolemaic priest, Manetho, concerning the Hyksos that they resided at Memphis, built a fortress in the "Sethroite nome" the city Avaris against the threat of the Assyrians (!). The garrison at Avaris numbered 240,000 men. After the kings of the "Thebaid" had driven the Hyksos from the throne, the latter walled themselves up at Avaris and withstood the siege. At last they concluded a treaty permitting 240,000 men, entire households to leave Egypt; they settled in Judea and built the city of Jerusalem. Against Apion I, 14 in the Loeb Library (para. 73-90), (New York, 1961), Vol. pp. 190-199.

XUM

improved body armor and weaponry, distinctive jewelry and pottery, and a flair for commerce and science. It would be rash to identify the Hyksos with the Hapiru groups active throughout the Levant at this time although Wilson notes that the invading Hyksos included restless elements from Syria-Palestine and show a marked ethnic diversity.[49]

The Egyptians were city builders prior to the Hyksos occupation but they were urbane without an urbs. The Pharaohs constructed cities wherever they resided which normally coincided with the cite of their tomb. An unusually well documented example is the city of Akhetaton 300 miles north of Thebes. At this virgin site Iknaton built his dream city in a plain protected on three sides by cliffs, a plain eight miles in length and twelve to eighteen in width. Stelae mark the limits of the city around the plain; the river flows through its center with customs houses at each end to check traffic tolls. The cliffs were hewn to accomodate the royal family upon their death; alabaster quarries were located along the river and extending about three miles eastward toward the cliffs. The city was planned and engineered by Thutmose and Bek of Thebes. Bordering the Nile is the royal palace laid out in a long T-shape; across the King's Way, the Great and Smaller Temples were erected; southeast of the smaller temple the houses of the nobles were placed, northeast of the Great Temple the dwellings of the temple staff, and between the temples a small Foreign Office. This was the South City. The North City and its palace built by his widow Nefertiti were nearby. A pleasure temple

---

[49] Wilson, The Burden of Egypt, (Chicago, 1951), p. 171.

Maru-Aton and summer palace were located at the southern end of the plain. It took eight years to complete the city, the last six of which Iknaton was present; it lasted eighteen.

The Amarna letters attest to Iknaton's political naivete in the face of intrigue. He could not believe that all people did not desire the peace and harmony he had created in his dream city. Artists, farmers, scribes and tomb-builders were at peace. He worshipped Aton, the sun-god; they worshipped him, the sun king. The former cult of Amon whose stronghold was the priesthood in Thebes proved to be Iknaton's downfall. His religious and political utopia based in the "City of the Horizon" was a significant but short lived revolution.

The Memphite Theology relates the city's significance to the act of creation by the city deity Ptah.[50] The union of the Two Lands came about at Memphis where the gods Horus and Seth made peace. At Thebes a similar claim to be the site of creation comes from a text dating shortly after the Amarna revolution. Men came into being in her after water and land had come to be; they found every other city in her name. Thebes was "the City' and all others exist in virtue of her. "She is the norm."[51]

Egyptian literature reveals no rancor against the city as such. This may be due to a variety of reasons; chief among them perhaps is the phenomenon that Egypt did not have a city to speak of until the New Kingdom.[52] On the

---

[50] Wilson, ANET, pp. 4-6.

[51] Ibid., p. 8.

[52] Idem., The City Invincible, p. 126.

other hand all the symptoms of urbanization were present but did not create urbanism. The religious ideology in dynastic times was so compelling that the psychology of the Egyptian was the passive and grateful acceptance of the present order. The stability of his universe obviated the natural conflicts in an equal and competitive society. Egypt survived for many centuries in the manner of a large religious community; politicking may have existed but the religious matrix overcame discordant and factious parties. Thus one may conclude that the Egyptian attitude toward the city was not negative, on the other hand one must qualify in what sense it was positive. In the framework of the form of the civilization, the institution of the divine-king, the city had little importance beyond its function as the temporary residence of the Pharaoh. Other settlements were not regarded as cities, thus nothing can be said of them. Lavish praise is heaped on the royal cities in the hymns but only because of the presence of the god-king. Egyptian culture included much that was urban without ever becoming citified; as a consequence the Egyptians have left no reflections on the propriety of urban life.

Ex. 1:11 relates that the Hebrews built store-cities for the Pharaoh. Within a short time they escaped to the desert under the leadership of Moses. The biblical text of J stands as the only literary witness to the presence of the Israelites in Egypt. The suggestion presents itself that perhaps a lingering hatred for the city remained with them long after they had settled in Canaan.

XUM

C. CANAAN

As early as the fourth millenium the territory as far north as ancient Ugarit in Syria and as far south as the Negev in Palestine was settled by a people known as the Canaanites.[53] Their origin is unknown but their subsequent history has become known through the mass of literary and archaeological evidence that has survived the vicissitudes of time. Canaan never developed into a third world empire but did enjoy the benefits of acting as a medium for the two powers, Mesopotamia and Egypt. Canaan, in part or wholly, remained under the dominance of some foreign power throughout its history down to the Iron Age; the brief periods of autonomy correspond to those of decline in Mesopotamian, Hittite, or Egyptian rule. Canaan was a melting pot of peoples of sundry ethnic origins of which the Ras Shamra texts testify regarding Ugarit's populace in the 15th-14th centuries B. C.

From the Early Bronze Age, several cities had established themselves

---

[53] Cf. W. F. Albright, "The Role of the Canaanites in the History of Civilization," BANE, p. 438ff. Cf. also, M. Dahood, "Canaan and Canaanites," New Catholic Encyclopedia III (New York, 1966), pp. 1-2. B. Maisler (Mazar), "Canaan and the Canaanites," BASOR 102 (1946), pp. 7-12, observes that in reference to an object כנען (or its multiple variants) it meant the red or blue purple dye manufactured along the Phoenician coast in Tyre, Sidon, Byblos and other parts; in reference to a geographic place it designated the Egyptian province of Palestine, Syria and Phoenicia; in reference to a people it was an appellative for a particular caste of merchants dealing in purple dyes. Cf. also, J. C. L. Gibson, "Observations on Some Important Ethnic Terms in the Pentateuch," JNES, 20 (1961), pp. 217-220; R. DeVaux, "Le Pays de Canaan," JAOS 88 (1968), pp. 23-30; idem, Palestine in the Early Bronze Age, CAH, rev. ed. Vol. 1 ch. 15 (Cambridge, 1965). Cf. also, J. Gray, The Canaanites, (New York, 1965), passim.

within Canaan and it may be safe to say that from this time onward the primary form of social and political organization was the city-state.[54] Egyptian dominance of Canaan may have preceded the Fifth Dynasty but evidence of their presence is only visible following it during Pepi I.[55] However, between 2100 and 1900 B. C. there is a rapid decline in the density of the settled populace in Palestine on either side of the Jordan river. This is the time of the first Intermediate period in Egypt, the Eleventh Dynasty, a time of internal weakness and incursions of Asiatics into the eastern Delta.[56] A reurbanization began c.1850 with a new influx of population, probably, Amorites from Northern Syria-

---

[54] A. Alt, "The Settlement of the Israelites in Palestine," Essays on Old Testament History and Religion (Garden City, 1968), pp. 180-181. K. Kenyon, Archaeology in the Holy Land, 3rd rev. ed. (New York, 1970), pp. 102-103. P. Lapp, "Palestine in the Early Bronze Age," NEA in the 20th Century, pp. 101-131.

[55] From the inscription on the tomb of Uni, commander of the army of Pepi I at Abydos, Egypt, the victory hymn tells of the "land of the Sand-dwellers" having orchards, vineyards, fortified towns, dwellings, and troops. Although the action is described as punitive this is not conclusive evidence that Egypt ruled. ANET, p. 228. Kenyon believes that at no time in this period did Egypt rule; a military post under a "client-ruler" maintained Egyptian interests. Cf. Kenyon, op. cit., p. 103.

[56] G. Posener, Syria and Palestine c.2160-1780 B. C. E.; Relations with Egypt, CAH, 2nd ed. Vol. I, Pt. 2, Ch. 25, pp. 532-537. Also, W. F. Albright, "The Egyptian Empire in Asia in the Twenty-first Century." IPOS 8 (1928), pp. 223-256.

XUM

Mesopotamia.[57] The best documentation for Syro-Palestinian history occurs for the period between the 18th and 14th centuries.[58] These documents shed

---

[57] R. T. O'Callaghan, Aram Naharaim: A Contribution to the History of Upper Mesopotamia in the Second Millenium B.C., Analecta Orientalia 26 (1948), pp. 18-32. Also, R. Amiran, "The Beginning of Urbanization in Canaan," NEA in the 20th Century, pp. 83-100.

[58] Only the briefest account may be given here of the place, number of tablets found, content, period, and principal collection in which they may be found today.

(a) Mari, Syria, Tell Hariri, 25,000 tablets excavated since 1933 containing diplomatic correspondence and administrative dockets of Amorite provenance, 18th century. Archives Royales de Mari, I-XV, XXII, XXXI. Paris.

(b) Chagar Bazar, Syria, 92 tablets discovered in 1936 containing economic lists, 18th century. C. J. Gadd, "Tablets from Chagar Bazar, 1936," Iraq 4 (1937), pp. 178-185; idem, "Tablets from Chagar Bazar and Tell Brak, 1937-38," Iraq, 7 (1940), pp. 22-66.

(c) Alalah, Turkey, Tell el-Atshanah, 457 Akkadian tablets excavated since 1937 containing treaties contracts, correspondence, inventories, supply lists; also a narrative inscription on the statue of Idrimi, king of Alalah, 18th to 17th centuries. L. Woolley, Alalakh, An Account of the Excavations at Tell Atchana, 1937-1949 (London, 1955); S. Smith, The Statue of Idri-mi. Occasional Publications of the British Institute of Archaeology in Ankara, No. 1 (London, 1949).

(d) Nuzi, Iraq, Yaghlan Tepe, 4,000 tablets excavated since 1925 containing legal texts, 15th century. JEN, I-VI; HSS. Excavations at Nuzi, I-VII.

(e) Tell Ta'annek, Palestine, 13 tablets from the 15th century. F. Hrozný in E. Sellin, Tell Ta'annek. Denkschriften der Kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften in Wien. Philo-Hist. Klasse, L (Wien, 1904), pp. 113-122, Taf. X-XI.

(f) Hattusas, Turkey, Bogazkale, 10,000 tablets containing a great variety of texts especially vassal treaties, 14th century. E. Weidner, Politische Dokumente aus Kleinasien. Die Staatsverträge in akkadischer Sprache aus dem Archiv von Boghazkoi. Boghazkoi Studien 8-9 (Leipzig, 1923).

(g) El-Amarna, Egypt, 377 tablets containing diplomatic correspondence in Akkadian, Hurrian, and Luwian, 14th century. EA, I-II, 2nd ed. (Leipzig, 1964).

(h) Ugarit, Syria, Ras Shamra, 439 tablets in Akkadian containing commercial, diplomatic, and legal texts as well as mythological texts in a unique cuneiform alphabet, 14th to 13th centuries. C.F.A. Shaeffer, Ugaritica I-VI. Bibliotheque Archéologique et Historique, XXXI, XLVII, LXIV, LXXIV, LXXX-LXXXI. (Paris, 1939-1974).

XUM

needed light on the urbiculture of Canaan during the second millenium. The attitude found in the Yahwist source did not exist in a vacuum, insulated from the cultural past of Canaan. Therefore a clearer portrait of the urban institutions, societal structures, political and religious movements of these times will aid in the description and reconstruction of the J writer's attitude.

The population mix in Canaan reflects its position as the land bridge between Africa and Asia. As stated previously, the coastline populace might be termed Canaanite with the original designation of "trader", "merchant" in the foreground. Further inland one frequently encounters the Amorites, a term as precise as perhaps "African" is today. The decline in power in Mesopotamia and Egypt and the appearance of the Amorites coincide at the beginning of the period. By the 18th century an Amorite kingdom was established at Mari. Shortly thereafter Babylon and Sumer were to come under the control of the first Amorite dynasty; in Syria and Palestine smaller kingdoms replace Egyptian hegemony.

1. THE PEOPLES OF CANAAN

Although S. R. Driver would understand "Amorite" as a racial name and "Canaanite" as geographical, more recently scholars such as Haldar and Gibson have concluded that both terms are geographical and "Canaanite"

is more probably social.[59] Haldar proposes that with respect to the Amorite "invasion" of Mesopotamia no violent horde of ravaging nomads brought Ibi-Sin's reign to a bloody conclusion. Rather, the Amorites, i.e., various peoples from the West, infiltrated individual city-states over a period of 600 years; some intermarried with the natives, others kept to themselves.[60] When local authority weakened, the Amorite leaders asserted themselves from within the society. Their apparently nomadic manner may be explained by their occupation as merchants travelling from west to east and back again. Such merchants did not travel unarmed and ill-prepared to defend goods and

---

59 S. R. Driver, Genesis, Westminster Commentaries, (London, 1954), 12th ed. rev., p. 126. A. Haldar, Who Were the Amorites? (Leiden, 1971), p. 51; hereafter cited as Haldar, Amorites. J. C. L. Gibson, op. cit., pp. 222-223.

60 The myth of the marriage of the West Semitic god Martu to the Sumerian god Numushda's daughter portrays some of the Sumerian contempt for the Amorite. The point of the myth may be that the daughter should serve her future husband's Amorite gods, then the Sumerian attitude would be: what would a decent Sumerian girl be doing seen with an Amorite? Buccellati has accepted the charges of the duenna at face value that the Amorite ate uncooked meat, did not live in houses, dug mushrooms, did not bury his dead, did not know grain, The Amorites of the Ur III Period, (Naples, 1966), pp. 330-331. The Deuteronomist reflects the Sumerian viewpoint in Jdgs. 3:1-6 wherein he states that the Israelites did "evil in the sight of the Lord" by intermarriage with the pre-Israelite population. Those who enter the covenant at Shechem are specifically told to choose between the gods of the Amorites or Yahweh Jos. 24:15, 18. Religion and social customs are often reciprocals and it seems that the Israelite writers were not less concerned than the Sumerians with the religious consequences of this social act. That the Sumerian author has included elements from an anti-Amorite tradition peu flatteuse should not be taken as evidence of their nomadic form of life but of the Sumerian racial bias.

profits, so they may have had the aspect of a hostile roving band. Men who continue to worship their own gods would be viewed as foreigners by the indigenous group and therefore doubly suspect, because they worshipped other gods, and engaged in buying and selling as a full time profession instead of something less suspect such as farming. That they were known to dwell in tents would not be extraordinary for merchants, nor does their use of kinship terms "father" for ruler or "brother" for equal lesser potentates indicate that they were tribal nomads. In fact there is no intrinsic connection with tribal organization and previous nomadism.[61]

The precise cause of the migratory movements of large independent social groups from north to south in Syria-Palestine has not been discovered. Increasing deforestation followed by desiccation would make once arable land unfit for cultivation. Whether this occurred in northern Syria and Anatolia at the start of the second millenium is a continuing subject of investigation.[62] Changes in water supply, overpopulation, natural disasters, political and social breakdowns that make continued settlement unsafe are some reasons for discontinuity of settlement. While any one of these causes would uproot

---

[61] Haldar, Amorites, pp. 53-56. If Haldar is correct about the non-nomadic past of the Amorites in Mesopotamia, might not the same attention be extended the Amorites in Canaan? And if the Amorites, what of the Israelites?

[62] E. Anati, Palestine Before the Hebrews, (New York, 1963), p. 312.

a social group and compel it to find new habitable land, it does not project them ipso facto into nomadism.[63]

According to Kenyon, archaeological evidence points to the Amorite presence in Syria-Palestine around 2300 B.C., or at the end of the Early Bronze Age and beginning of Middle Bronze I.[64] It also marks the dissolution of the highly urbanized civilization of EB and the start of an interlude of non-urban character. There is greater pottery evidence for a fresh influx of population at the end of EB than there is for the entry of the Israelites in LB. Kenyon reasons that the Amorites, unlike the Israelites who adopted the native culture, did not assimilate the previous culture. From a study of burial customs at Jericho she concludes that the EB urban civilization "was abruptly terminated by the arrival of a people not interested in town life, who throughout maintained a loose tribal organization, and whose habits remained those of semi-nomadic pastoralists".[65] It is important to

---

[63] One would surely not conclude that the great Potato Famine of mid-nineteenth century Ireland converted the peasants into nomadic hordes invading Boston, New York and Philadelphia.

[64] K. Kenyon, Amorites and Canaanites, (London, 1966), p. 76. Kenyon agrees fully with the notion that the Amorites were a landless nomadic people as Ibi-Sin has described them. Disconcerting in Kenyon's analysis of pottery data is her principle that a change in pottery signifies an ethnic change in potters. Without denying that such indeed may be the case, one hesitates to infer what conclusions an archaeologist might draw from the proliferation of mini-skirts in the late 1960's. Was it that millions of British girls roamed the United States and Europe in numbers perhaps exceeding the total population of Great Britain? Cf. W. G. Dever, "The 'Middle Bronze I' Period in Syria and Palestine", NEA in the 20th Century, pp. 130-163; K. Kenyon, Palestine in the Middle Bronze Age, CAH, Vol. 2. ch. 3, 1966.

[65] Kenyon, Amorites, p. 22.

note that lacking evidence from settlements such conclusion must be based solely on funerary data. Schaeffer has found that the newcomers were highly skilled metal workers,[66] as the Sumerian text also relates concerning the Amorites.[67] Evidence at Jericho, Tell Ajjul, and Tell ed-Duweir in the tombs provide similar but not identical daggers as those at Ugarit.[68] Nevertheless the Amorite presence in southern Palestine, the Cisjordan, and northwards to the Anatolian frontier is indisputable; their presence in the Transjordan is conjectural due to the scanty evidence from MB II.[69]

As Gelb has shown, the Amorites were a West Semitic group who linguistically contained several different tongues according to the social sub-groups to be found. Some of them infiltrated Mesopotamia in the third millenium eventually becoming the ruling dynasty at Larsa and Isin early in the second millenium. Others infiltrated Syria-Palestine at the end of EB IV and remained on the land, perhaps not as a distinct group, down to Israelite ascendancy. Since the term, "Amorite", in extra biblical sources frequently

---

66 C. F. A. Schaeffer, Ugaritica II, (Paris, 1939-1961), pp. 49-120.

67 E. Chiera, Sumerian Epics and Myths, Oriental Institute Publications No. 15, (Chicago, 1934), No. 58, col. IV.

68 Kenyon, Amorites, p. 42.

69 Ibid., p. 64. In Kenyon's perspective the Amorites settled all of Syria-Palestine during the interlude between EB and MB. At Byblos they merged with the local populace and the Canaanite culture was born. From thence it spread elsewhere in Syria-Palestine.

connotes a geographical designation admitting ethnic plurality, one may assume that in Palestine they never existed as a distinct ethnic group but came from northern Amurru in search of Lebensraum and settled with or without the blessing of the natives. The Amorite dynasty at Mari is founded by Iagi-lim in the 19th century and continues, except for an interruption of sixteen years, to the reign of Zimri-lim who is disposed of by Hammurabi of Babylon in 1695 B.C. Babylonian literature, historical and religious texts were found at Mari so that one may suppose it was a channel through which Mesopotamian culture reached Canaan via the Amorites.

During the Middle Kingdom, the Egyptians maintained trade relations with Syria-Palestine notably with the ports of Ugarit and Byblos. The Execration Texts from the Twelfth or Thirteenth Dynasty indicate that many city-states existed in the land of Retenu prior to 1800 B.C.[70]

A new power, the Hyksos, descended from the north and occupied first Syria-Palestine and then Egypt until their expulsion by Ah-mose I, 1570 B. C. The political system they employed in Syria-Palestine, that of city-states, remained the dominant characteristic of the political order until the time of David. Their rise was due in no little part to their mastery of the horse and chariot in warfare. This feature has led many commentators to believe that they formed

---

[70] ANET, pp. 328-329; cf., also ANET, pp. 19-20 give Sinuhe's account of his sojourn in Retenu, the Egyptian term for Canaan. Cf. also, S. Abramski, Ancient Towns in Israel, (Jerusalem, 1963); G. Buccellati, Cities and Nations of Ancient Syria: An Essay on Political Institutions with Special Reference to the Israelite Kingdom. Studi Semitici 26 (Roma, 1967).

XUM

a military aristocracy of a privileged social and economic status. Alt remarks:

> In an economy with little or no money it is normal for rulers who wish to rely on the services of such an equestrian class to invest the appropriate persons with the tenure of large holdings of land, thus ensuring their economic stability, raising them socially and binding them personally to their lords.[71]

This condition seems to have prevailed into the Amarna period wherein the numerous vassal rulers of the Eighteenth Dynasty compete with one another for political power through control of cities and their satellite lands. Alt further indicates that while land tenure may not have been hereditary in the early stages it tended to become so just as sons inherited military control and social status from their fathers.[72] In this manner two factors arose: 1) the peasants were permanently deprived of owning the land, and 2) towns became fortified cities controlling a population of serfs or hupshu.[73]

The Hyksos were forced to retreat from Egypt probably as far north as Kadesh on the Orontes. Egypt strengthened its hand in Palestine by inserting her own men to rule the various city-states; Thutmoses III began the custom

---

[71] A. Alt, Essays on Old Testament History and Religion, (Garden City, 1966), p. 184.

[72] Ibid.

[73] Albright, BANE, p. 452. Sees no indication of a true middle class in Canaanite society between the partly non-Semitic military aristocracy and the semi-free slave.

of counting his captives according to their country (or as most frequently the case, their city-state).[74] The Hittites from Anatolia asserted themselves by applying pressure from the north; Syria as far south as Lebanon became incorporated into their empire by 1450 B.C. They may have penetrated as far as Hebron as a band of merchants.[75] Yet another group, the Hurrians from Armenia spread out into the cities east of the Tigris, west and south into Mitanni, and finally Syria-Palestine where they are found in the Amarna period. Hittites are generally regarded as Indo-European in origin whereas the Hurrians are Armenoid, thus they comprise a large part of the non-Semitic element in Syro-Palestinian society during the second millenium. The Hurrians were known as skilled horsemen, a trait often associated with the Hyksos, and are designated in Akkadian and Egyptian texts by the term maryannu, military elite.[76] They constructed fortified cities and castles across northern Mesopotamia and Syria during

---

[74] ANET, pp. 242-243. A detailed picture of clusters of urban settlements in Palestine - save only a scattering in the central and southern hill country - emerges from the Execration Texts and the campaign lists of Thutmoses III.

[75] C. H. Gordon, "Abraham and the Merchants of Ur," JNES 17 (1953), pp. 28-31, proposes too late a dating for the Patriarchal period but convincingly argues that Abraham was a merchant from Hittite territory. Contra cf. W. F. Albright, "Abram the Hebrew: A New Archaeological Interpretation," BASOR 163 (1961), pp. 36-54, esp. pp. 44-54.

[76] The maryannu were a noble ruling class of Indo-Iranian origin known from the study of their personal names and deities. Cf. M. Noth, The Old Testament World, (Philadelphia, 1966), p. 241.

the height of their power (c. 1700).[77]

The Arameans of the early Iron Age emerge again in northern Syria perhaps migrating from the Syrian desert or the region called Aram Naharaim with the city of Harran an important center. Gen. 22:21 (J) relates them to Nahor, the brother of Abraham; Gen. 31:20 (J) refers to Laban as an Aramean and likewise in 31:24 (E), and in Dt. 26:5 it is Jacob whose father is said to be a "wandering Aramean". They seem to have settled the Trans-Jordan as part of the late second millenium movements which witness the appearance of the kingdoms of Moab and Edom, and Ammon as well. They did establish a chain of flourishing commercial city-states in Syria from the 12th century down to the assertion of the Assyrians in the 8th and 9th centuries, some of which provided a constant opportunity for warfare to Israelite kings.

Syria-Palestine in the second millenium is a land of great ethnic diversity as nearly every source document reports.[78] Fresh waves of peoples appear in succession in Canaan, each contributing something to the ongoing acculturation which took place. However, certain social forms determinative

---

[77] E. A. Speiser, "Ethnic Movements in the Near East in the Second Millenium B. C.," AASOR 31 (1931-32), pp. 13-54.

[78] Ugarit is a parade example of the cosmopolitan character of the cities. Cf. F. Gröndahl, Die Personennamen der Texte aus Ugarit, (Rome, 1967), pp. 268-297. Also, M. Noth, "Die syrisch-palästinische Bevölkerung des zweiten Jahrtausends vor Chr im Lichte neuer Quellen," ZDPV 65 (1942), pp. 9-67; M. Liverani, Storia di Ugarit: Nell'Età degli Archivi Politici, Studi Semitici 6 (Rome, 1962), passim.

XUM

for the early history of Israel appear early and remain dominant in Canaan throughout the period, viz., tribal organization, and the city-state system, which give the particular character to the form of civilization in Canaan.[79]

2. THE CANAANITE SOCIAL ORDER[80]

It must be remarked at the outset of any description of Canaanite society in pre-Israelite epigraphy, that it reflects the mind and interests of the royal court, its administrative personnel, and the viewpoint of the powerful upper strata of the society. What may be known of the lower classes comes either when they serve the court or rebel against it. Rib-Addi's complaint that his own hupšu have left him also tells us of the extreme situation they are in.[81] Thus in politically chaotic times of revolt, such as that depicted in the Amarna period, one learns more of the people, their exploitation and the defenders of the status quo than in court records of the

---

[79] It is obvious that many other social forms are related and could be pursued as well, such as, law, warfare, kingship. Cf. A. E. Glock, Warfare in Mari and Early Israel, unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Michigan, 1968, in which the author speaks of warfare and the king's exercise of control by directing hostile energies towards an external foe and law as the function of his control within the kingdom. A contrasting approach to warfare may be seen in Y. Yadin, "Warfare in the Second Millenium B.C." WHJP, V. 2 (Giratayim, 1970), pp. 127-159, wherein it is not treated as a social act but as a military stratagem. Cf. J. Gray, The Legacy of Canaan, SVT, V (1957), pp. 160-164 on kingship.

[80] I. Mendelsohn, "Society and Economic Conditions," WHJP, Vol. 3, pp. 39-51.

[81] EA, 85: 12ff, 114:21ff.

royal family.

a. THE ELITE

The structure as found in the 18th century Ugaritic texts is that of a city-state kingdom. The king is the keystone of the social order. He enjoys the communion of the gods and men. He participates in the cult as high priest and mediator of divine revelation.[82] He was the dispenser of justice to all alike through ad hoc divine aid and his own natural wisdom guided by communal custom but not a codex of law. Also in the early period he is the leader in war inspiring his men to follow him with enthusiasm as a personal service.

By the 14th century he wages war by means of his military aristocracy whose names appear to be of Indo-Iranian extraction. Following the Hyksos period Hurrian names as military chiefs may be found at Ugarit and in the Amarna letters.[83] In return for military service the king would grant

---

[82] J. Gray, The Legacy, p. 160; also, idem, Archaeology and the Old Testament World, (New York, 1965), pp. 138-139. In the latter work Gray compares the Davidic kingship with Canaanite, Mesopotamian and Egyptian models and concludes that the local feudal order long in existence in Canaan best illustrates the setting of the Davidic. Note R. DeVaux, Ancient Israel, pp. 117-119, for the existence of the king's consort at Ugarit.

[83] Names such as Biridiya (EA, 242, 3), Widia (320, 5) Tadua (286, 2); at Ugarit King Nigmad (Nigmed), see n. 76, also C. F. N. Schaeffer, The Cuneiform Texts of Ras-Shamra-Ugarit, (London, 1939), p. 16. Note also in the Keret Epic that the king marries a non-Semitic princess (Hurrian) possibly suggesting the political symbiosis, J. Gray, The KRT Text in the Literature of Ras Shamra: A Social Myth of Ancient Canaan, (Leiden, 1964), 2nd ed., pp. 4-5. The Sardanu (Serdan) of EA 123, 15 are considered Aegean mercenaries by Gray, cf. Legacy, p. 162, esp. n. 3. J. L. McKenzie, DB, p. 379.

a parcel of land in perpetuum to the maryannu-warrior, thus creating a feudal relationship of king and baron. But many others were granted land as payment for service as Gray reads:

> ...šrm (rev. 9-11), "singers", and nqdm (rev. 12-15) "shepherds", of whom we know that the chief priest Atnprln was the head. To these we should add tqrm (rev. 7-8), "doorkeepers", mhsm (rev. 25-26), "butchers", šrm (30-32-rev. 4), "butlers", and trrm (rev. 16-21), which we take as "inspectors" of either entrails or stars. If we are right in taking mdm (1-16), "measurers" as custodians of weights and measures, they may reasonably be regarded as cultic officials, since weights and measures were anciently protected by divine sanction.[84]

All of these came from the class of cultic personnel. Among the military, one finds besides the chariot experts (maryannu), two others that hold land grants: the bdl mrynm, substitutes for the maryannu who could not render service because of age or injury, and the mr'u ebrn, mr'u skn, groups of retainers, mšrglm, groups of armorers. Thus one might get land through service to the king either in the cultic capacities or the military; no provision is made in the texts for anyone else nor any other means save revolt.

The peasant might be conscripted for corvée labor on royal projects, or armed service as a ḫubšu (ḫupšu), possibly a yoeman in the infrantry, or archer, or reserves in general. The terms ḫpt and tun occur in the Keret

---

[84] Gray, "Feudalism in Ugarit and Early Israel," ZAW, 64 (1952), pp. 50-51. Cf. also, M. S. Drower, Ugarit, CAH, Vol. 2, ch. 21B, 1968.

Epic ii 90-91: "...Peasant levies without number, trained regulars beyond reckoning".[85] The precise meaning of hpt and its relation to ḫubšu is still a matter of discussion.[86] The status of the hpt seems to be analogous to that of the maryannu: his freedom from working the lands to render capital for the king was his fief in perpetuum as much as land was that of the aristocratic maryannu. The hpt was bound to render military service instead of agricultural quotas. Yet it is not incompatible that in times of peace he did work the land for his own subsistence as the Alalakh texts suggest.[87] The plight of the peasant in the Amarna period was indeed desperate.

Whatever tribal organization may have preceded the rise of the feudal order, traces of it do not remain in the documents. By the time of the Late Bronze period legal documents, perhaps contemporary with the El-Amarna tablets, reflect a system of civil law parallel with the principles of

---

[85] Italics added.

[86] Gray, Keret Epic, pp. 40-41; "Feudalism," pp. 53-54; Legacy, pp. 169-171. J. Pedersen, Israel: Its Life and Culture, I - II, (Copenhagen, 1964), pp. 498-99; idem, "Note on the Hebrew Hopsī," JPOS 6 (1926), 103-105. R. DeVaux, Ancient Israel, p. 88. W. F. Albright, "Canaanite Hopši, "Free", in the Amarna Tablets," JPOS 4 (1924), pp. 169-170; idem, "Canaanite ḫapši and Hebrew ḥopšî again," JPOS 6 (1926), pp. 106-108; idem, "New Canaanite Historical and Mythological Data," BASOR 63 (1936), pp. 23-32, in this article he translates a portion of the Keret Epic ii 90-91 as "three thousand myriads - serfs without number, peasants without count". p. 29.

[87] D. J. Wiseman, The Alalakh Tablets, Occasional Publications of the British Institute of Archaeology in Ankara, No. 2, (London, 1953), pp. 10-11.

the urban system of Mesopotamia.[88] The fact that corvées were reckoned according to district and not by tribe is a further indication of the administrative reach of the central power over population movement. It requires a fairly sedentary populace to enable the executive control to compute the numbers and exact action when ordered. Districts are constructs of the political regime and are significant only if they can be enforced; Alt's thesis that ancient territorial divisions outlive individual political powers has considerable merit if one understands the Lebensform of the peasantry.[89]

b. THE PEASANTRY

The picture of society that emerges from a study of the documents of the second millenium in Canaan is anything but primitive. In a primitive society producers control the means of production including: a) their own labor, and b) the exchange of their own labor and its products for goods deemed culturally necessary or for the service others may provide in return.[90] This is certainly not the case in a society based on feudal power as seen in Ugarit and Byblos.

---

[88] F. Thureau - Dangin, "Trois Contrats de Ras - Shamra," Syria 18 (1937), pp. 246-255; I. Mendelsohn, "On Corvée Labor in Ancient Canaan and Israel," BASOR 167 (1962), pp. 31-35.

[89] Alt, Essays, pp. 175-221.

[90] Cf. M. D. Sahlins, "Political Power and Economy in Primitive Society," in Essays in the Science of Culture: In Honor of Leslie A. White, eds. G. E. Dole and R. L. Carneiro (New York, 1960), p. 408; G. Sjoberg, "Folk and 'Feudal' Societies," AJS, 58 (1952), pp. 231-239, note in particular his typology of the feudal system, pp. 232-233.

What has taken place is a transition from a tribal form to an urban form of living: the control of the means of production, viz., human labor, has passed from the individual to an executive group supported by force. The king surrounded by his military aristocracy was the executive group exercising total control over the fund of power, the productivity of the people and their land; a situation that would obtain during the united monarchy of Israel.

Every empire of the Ancient Near East was agriculturally based (recall pp. 37-38). It is equally true that a peasant society such as that of Egypt may exist without need of the city but the city cannot exist without the peasant. In Mesopotamia, Egypt, and Canaan the peasant group provided surpluses that are transferred to the dominant group of rulers than underwrite their own standard of living, then distribute the remainder to other non-agricultural groups, military and cultic personnel, for specific goods and services. Goods are no longer exchanged between groups but are first furnished to a center and only later re-directed (note I Kgs. 4:1-28).

Rib-Addi of Byblos informs the Pharaoh that his ḫupšu have pledged as corvée their own sons and daughters, and wooden tools for cultivating in the fields of Iarimuta for deliverance of their lives;[91] if he is not given grain to feed his peasants they will desert him for his enemy Abdi-Asirta;[92]

---

[91] EA, 81, 33-41.

[92] EA, 118, 21-23; 125, 14-30; 85, 8-15.

and that his own peasants have been advised to kill him because he has not provided for their safety and subsistence;[93] and finally, that his own palace guard fails to protect him when attempted assassinations occur.[94] The social balance has completely deteriorated from the serene description in the Keret Epic. In the Amarna period the subsistence level of the hupšu was not being met; this in turn signified several other developments: a) if he had not enough to eat, the peasant would not have enough surplus grain to provide seed for next year, or feed his livestock, b) he has no way of replacing annual equipment loss for production and consumption, in fact he has given them away to save his life, c) he has no fund from which to carry on simple social relations such as a dowry, or ceremonial offerings,[95] d) he is so destitute that in the asymmetrically based feudal order he cannot pay his taxes, or rent for land use (since the king or a member of the upper class owned it). The stark reality is vividly stated by Rib-Addi as he reports that his peasants are joining the SA-GAZ men, allies and confederates of his enemy Abdi-Asirta.[96] He is well aware that deprived of his peasants'

---

[93] EA, 81, 6-14.

[94] EA, 81, 15-17; 74, 25-26. Cf. also, E. F. Campbell, The Chronology of the Amarna Letters, (Baltimore, 1964); W. F. Albright, The Amarna Letters from Palestine. Syria, the Phillistines and Phoenicia. CAH, Vol. 2, ch. 20, 23, 1966.

[95] Notice the elaborate description of the bridal-price in the Keret Text: Gordon, UH, KRT, iii 205ff.

[96] EA, 73, 26; 74, 19; 88, 31-32; 84; 138, 93.

fund of rent he is deprived of his fund of power. This is essentially an urban system.

The peasant is a cultivator whose relationship to the city should be viewed as that of village to city.[97] The cities of Canaan are not all alike, some are administrative centers such as those in the Execration Texts and the Amarna Tablets; some are equally religious centers such as Ugarit, Harran, Megiddo, Hazor, and Hebron. Many were brisk trading centers such as Ugarit, Byblos, Tyre, Sidon, Hamath, Damascus, and Jericho. Thus the relationship to the city will be determined by the type of demand the city places on the peasant or by what opportunities it provides for his welfare. In Egypt the political, religious, and intellectual functions remained dispersed so there was no need for a center other than marketing.

The critical situation prevailing in Syria-Palestine during the 15th and 14th centuries according to the texts from Ugarit and Amarna indicate that the ḫupšu had two possible strategies to follow to meet both the demands of the royal tax collectors and his household's sustenance: 1) increase production but this would depend on how he could manage the ingredients of production; land, labor, and surplus (capital of some type); the data indicates that he had little possibility of going beyond or even of meeting

---

[97] See the discussion concerning Mesopotamian and Hebrew words for city and countryside above on pages 60-61; also, C. U. Wolf, "Village", IDB IV, p. 784; J. Perrot, "Premiers villages de Syria et de Palestine," Compte Rendus de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles Lettres, 1968, pp. 161-177.

the minimal needs; 2) in politically chaotic times the traditional liens on his fund for rent have weakened because the central power structure has become ineffective.[98] Therefore, he can escape the demands to underwrite payments, can break traditional social ties for religious support by: a) claiming the land for himself in the face of no opposition[99] or b) withdraw from the old regime in favor of a stronger and more congenial one, or c) withdraw from the land if he cannot succeed in any other manner.[100] The recurrent phrase that so-and-so has joined the SA-GAZ in all probability signifies that they have defected from their political allegiance by joining the "out-party". Another alternative for the peasant less dramatic but no less severe, would be to curtail consumption. Normally this is the first line of action taken. Only basic items are eaten, purchases minimized, and home grown produce

---

[98] Rib-Addi complains that he is virtually a prisoner in his own city (EA, 81, 19-22); "Behold, thus I remain shut up in the midst of my city. I cannot go out of the gate..."

[99] A study of the Nuzi feudal system indicates that upon the death of the tenant farmer the land reverts back to the crown to be redistributed afresh by the halsuhlu, the royal supervisor of the land. Rights of inheritance were prerogatives of the aristocracy and in times of political turmoil supervision of the land may slip back to the peasant. Cf. H. Lewy, "The Nuzi Feudal System," Orientalia, 11 (1942), p. 22.

[100] The SA-GAZ people do as they please to the point that Rib-Addi asks, who do they think they are. EA: 76:14-16; 104: 17-24. Perhaps the Deuteronomic historian means as much in Judges 21:25: "In those days there was no king in Israel; every man did what was right in his own eyes".

relied on as much as possible. In this precarious situation any novelty may undermine the balance and therefore greater cleavage to tradition is the norm. By nature the peasant is not a "joiner". His need to stay alive without undue commitments to a larger system explains his grass-roots conservatism. In wartime the urbanite may easily be separated from his livelihood, but the peasant has the land and his ability to make it produce. Thus it must be assumed that hupšu of the Amarna period selected a path most convenient to their interests. For some it would mean remaining faithful to the regent. For others it was an opportunity to seize the land they worked. For yet others it was time to revolt by joining those who stood over and against their oppressors.

Canaanites were renowned as merchants; Amorites were known to have carried on a vast caravan trade with Sumer; and Hittite merchants from the city of Ura probably plied their goods into southern Palestine as well as Ugarit.[101] The urban system of network marketing was that practiced in Ugarit as the Administrative texts relate, but may be presumed to have been the model for other centers throughout Canaan as well. In network markets there is a middleman, a professional, who stands between the primary producer and the consumer. Thus one man may raise and sell his cattle to the merchant; the merchant may market the milk or slaughter the cattle

---

101 Gordon, INES, 17 (1958), pp. 28-29. It is Gordon's conviction that Abraham was "a merchant prince; a tamkârum from the Hittite realms." p. 31; W. F. Albright, "The Excavations of Tell Beit Mirsim II," AASOR 17(1936-37), p. 5 argues that there was sufficient pasturage for a wool industry here.

and sell hides to the tanner, or meat, or fat to the consumer. The peasant finds himself in a market in which prices are not governed by custom or kinship as in the rural village, but by a stranger, by impersonal laws of supply and demand that he may not entirely understand and which he certainly does not control.[102] In this form of competition the peasant must be prepared to sell grain, milk, leather goods, pots and pans, whatever product brings the best current market price. Between sowing and harvest the peasant may develop craft skills and products so as to be more flexible. It is not inconceivable that a cultivator also keep a herd of sheep, a few cows and goats, and has a basic skill in leather and weaving just to meet needs. Because he has limited witholding power in times of depression the peasant has few alternatives in short cycles of declining prices which occurred during periods of political chaos. Times of political uncertainty are dangerous for the merchant as well but they also afford chances for profiteering.[103] But the peasant may decide to tend the crops himself and send

---

[102] The Hebrew patriarchs are portrayed as wise in the ways of making one dollar earn two. Jacob outwits a nimble Laban; Isaac becomes a subject of envy to Abimelech's countrymen; Joseph requires that his brothers be honest before allowing them to trade.

[103] Take for example the case of a peasant who must borrow grain from the merchant because he has had to sell his grain early to meet urgent demands. The merchant lends at interest due at harvest time. Then the peasant sells his grain at 2 minas of silver (the market price) to the merchant, plus interest. The merchant buys at 2 minas and resells it to the peasant at the next short period at 4 minas. Thus the peasant is economically controlled and oppressed by the merchant.

XUM

his wife to sell and buy, or keep some male members at home for the fields and send sons and daughters out for hire as cited by Rib-Addi.

Caught in these economic binds, the peasant may confront the proliferation of middlemen by social exclusion, grouping all specialists of a kind different from himself and his locale as strangers and potential enemies. Thus he finds a social outlet and expression for economic domination within which he is powerless. He may very well find that he is not alone in his plight and so a cosa nostra may form of peasants like himself; a positive social relationship may develop but need not be enduring because its basis is not fundamental. Local merchants such as smithies, leather workers, scribes who practice discounts and "little extras" for favored consumers may be included. The peasant's enemy is anyone who has a lien on his fund of rent. This can be the merchant, the tax collector, the royal production supervisor who sets quotas and market prices, the labor contractor, and ultimately, the king. They all have one interest in the peasant: gain. Thus, in the network market system, the merchant - even when he resides in the village - continues to be regarded as a stranger and an outsider.[104]

---

[104] J. Nougayrol, Le Palais Royal D'Ugarit, IV, Mission de Ras Shamra, IX. dir. Claude F. A. Schaffer, (Paris, 1956), Texte 17, 130, pp. 103-105. Hereafter cited as PRU. An important letter of Hattusilis III to Niqmepa, king of Ugarit (1324-1274) answers the latter's complaint that the merchants of Ura were a burden to the city, instructed that they were to operate only during the summer, clear out by winter, and were not to own any land there. The term used for them signified "foreign traders" tamkâru. The inferior status of the merchant is further illustrated from the Hittite laws regarding the murder of a merchant. If anyone slays a free person or a slave in anger, or smites them causing their death he must surrender 2-4 persons in restitution, but if he slays a merchant a payment of coin will suffice. Cf. E. Neufeld, Hittite Laws, (London, 1951), pp. 1-2, 134.

c. LAND TENURE

The land of the peasant belonged to the regent by right of domain, i.e., the lord held ownership by heredity or royal grant, for a definite period of time or in perpetuity. The regent may parcel out land to his peasants, grant hunting rights, rights to pasture, woodland and fuel. In return the peasant must pay in produce or labor. The peasant, on his own level, may furnish housing to landless laborers in return for their labor or sublease the land to tenant farmers. The lot of the slave or serf must have been that of the landless, possibly in the service of the hupšu. Although a case may be made that the hupšu were "free proletarians" it would not take much stress on the system to have the hupšu become willingly or by force part of the serfdom.[105]

Gray concludes from Ugarit that the upper classes held land in perpetuity; thus, land held through inheritance is based on kinship and carries with it the right to receive tribute from its peasants.[106] Yet the Amarna texts reveal that the Pharaoh had appointed chiefs of his Canaanite provinces

---

[105] I. Mendelsohn, "The Canaanite Term for 'Free Proletarian'," BASOR, 83 (1941), 36-39; idem, "State Slavery in Ancient Palestine," BASOR 85 (1942), 14-17; idem, "New Light on the Hupšu," BASOR 139 (1955), pp. 9-11. Note also Joseph's agrarian plan in Gen. 47:13-26.

[106] Cf. Gray, ZAW 64:51-55. Cf. also, H. Reviv, "On Urban Representative Institutions and Self-Government in Syria-Palestine in the Second Half of the Second Millenium B.C.," JESHO, 12 (1969), pp. 283-297.

to administer his realm in his stead. Weber spoke of such domains as prebendal, i.e., the king granted officials land as income.[107] From the income derived from the peasant, the regents had the right to keep some of the taxes collected and receive a salary from the central bureau. It afforded the king greater centralized control because the regents depended on his good will for their position. The feudal domain was more stable but also provided a permanent power source of opposition to the king from his landed aristocracy. Therefore, it was necessary to surround domain with ceremony to lessen the edge of the single interest relationship: gain. In addition it provided a much needed basis for a constant concern of rulers everywhere: it underwrites their claim to legitimacy. Through ritual the ruler may assume the power and glory of the god or king for his district in acting out myths of fertility for men and fields.[108] Festivals give occasion for the normal state of the society to be put aside to ease the peasants' tension (Jdgs. 21:16-24); the Canaanites regulated every crisis of life from birth to the grave by customs designed to separate the participants from historical time and place them for a period in mythical time.

---

[107] M. Weber, Ancient Judaism, (New York, 1952), trans. and ed. by H. H. Gerth and D. Martindale, p. 169. Here Weber is speaking of the Jerusalemite priests' prebendal provisions placed under tighter state control by Joash.

[108] Neufeld, Hittite Laws, pp. 45-46, deals with a consecration ritual for dividing a field, probably performed by a priest for a family. The inference is that he who owns the land has its power, and that the god should act favorably in consort with the owner.

An in depth study of the peasants' control of his land, water, seed, draft animals, tools and labor is needed (but beyond the scope of the present study) to enable one to comprehend how their factors of production may and do become their debt titles. In the nature of their business, merchants could become creditors, money lenders, and bankers.[109] A peasant may have to pay to enjoy water rights, if he has no money he must borrow it and pay interest; the same may be true of his purchasing tools and yet again of renting draft animals. Thus, the creditor may keep the peasant permanently dependent at a subsistence level. If he deals in land and poplulation density is heavy, he may land speculate and still create a competitive market for loans. However, if he keeps the peasant at a minimum capacity for repayment he freezes capital; if he cannot always and easily recover his loan, and a bulk of laws indicate how real the

---

[109] C. H. Gordon, "Abraham of Ur," Hebrew and Semitic Studies, Presented to Godfrey Rolles Driver, ed. D. Winton Thomas and W. D. McHardy, (Oxford, 1963), p. 78. In speaking of Abraham, Gordon states: "He had every opportunity to lend precious metal on interest in Canaan in accordance with the methods of tamkârûtu 'business enterprise'." The laws of Hammurabi provide that if a person given in surety dies in the house of the creditor because of ill-treatment, the owner of the pledged person shall convict the merchant, i.e., creditor. Cf. G. R. Driver and J. C. Miles, The Babylonian Laws Vol. II (Oxford, 1955), p. 47, n. "j". Bourraburiash II, king of Babylon complains to Amenaphis IV in the Amarna tablets (EA 8) that his merchants were slain in Canaan, Egyptian land, and nothing has been done about it.

possibility was, he will charge exorbitant interest rates of 50 to 75%.[110]

At a time of political unrest there will be a steady turnover of those who hold claim to lands and debt titles. These short term relations make for quick money situations and increased tension between the impoverished peasant and the merchant group. The existence of a class of landlords and moneylenders whose real interests lie in living in urban areas removed from the countryside, who are aspiring for political office or favor, who exploit the rural opportunity as a means of accumulating wealth to further their own political and social ascendancy, creates a socially volatile moment. The city benefits from the surpluses milked from the countryside by the urban rent collectors without generating an expanded rural productivity. The system is self-limiting because it reduced incentives by reducing the peasants' consumption to the bare minimum.

Caution regarding the shift in semantic range must be used as to the precise meaning of hupšu in texts that span the period from early to late

---

110 That such an elaborate system existed in the Ancient Near East seems beyond doubt as one reads the laws of Hammurabi dealing with equitable interest rates merchants who lend grain or money may charge. Cf. Driver and Miles, The Babylonian Laws, II, pp. 39-41. Interest was fixed by CH:RL and this might fluctuate with the relative value of the basic unit, the GUR. But other rates were recognized as well: 1) "interest of the city" fixed by the town officials, 2) "interest of the market" fixed by the seller-group, 3) "interest of the temple" regulated by local temple priests, and 4) the "interest of Shamash" fixed by royal temple at 20%. For a money lender to exceed these rates would not be unheard of depending on the instability of the government and desperation of the debtor. Cf. Ibid., Vol. I, p. 174. Cf. also, J. L. McKenzie, "Loans", DB, p. 515. DeVaux, Ancient Israel, pp. 170-177.

XUM

second millenium, and are found in Babylon, Nuzi, Alalakh, Ugarit, Amarna, and the Old Testament. From the Amarna usage it would be difficult to press the case that the hupšu were landless peasants or "free proletarians", tenant farmers. It is apparent that they were economically and legally bound to their regent (hazannu), the city-ruler appointed by Egypt.

This extended analysis of the social relations prevailing in Canaan during the Amarna age will provide the proper setting for discussing the events which saw the Israelites take control of the land for themselves. The peoples of Cannan were of many ethnic origins; many were landless for a myriad of reasons. The conditions were ripe for a major upheaval in which the traditional political system of city-states would be tested.

It also is of some interest to note that some of these conditions reappear during the period of Solomon. If such social conditions continued from the Amarna age to the time of the Israelite settlement, and then recur during the time of the united monarchy, there is good reason to believe that anti-urban traditions may have found their way into the oral and later written traditions of the peoples that experienced the changes. If so, in what form do they survive, and for what purposes are they used?

3. THE SA.GAZ

It has been convincingly argued by Greenberg that the SA.GAZ of the second millenium were an ethnically heterogenous class of people found in Mesopotamia, Syria and Palestine.[111] He states:

> The core of the SA.GAZ/H. would seem to have been composed of uprooted, propertyless persons who

---

111 M. Greenberg, The Hab/piru, American Oriental Series, V. 39, eds. H.M. Hoenigswald, J. DeFrancis, G. Mendenhall, (New Haven, 1955), pp. 85-88. The full question of the identification of Apiru (Hab/piru) with the Hebrews will not be treated here. Cf. J. Bottéro, Le problème des Habiru à la quatrième rencontre assyriologique internationale, Cahiers de la Societe Asiatique, XII, (Paris, 1954), passim. A wide range of opinion on the subject has been expressed over the years, cf., P.E. Dhorme, "Les Habiru et les Hébreux," JPOS, 4(1924), pp. 162-168; G. A. Barton, "The Habiri of the El-Amarna Tablets and the Hebrew Conquest of Palestine," JBL 48(1929), pp. 144-147; E. Chiera, "Habiru and Hebrews," AJSL, 49(1932-3), pp. 115-124; E. Dhorme, "La Question des Habiri," Revue de l'histoire des religions, 118(1938), pp. 170-187, H. H. Rowley, "Ras Shamra and the Habiru Question," PEQ, 72(1940), pp. 90-94; J. W. Jack, "New Light on the Habiru-Hebrew Question," PEQ, 72(1940), pp. 95-115; A. Guillaume, "The Habiru, the Hebrews, and the Arabs," PEQ, 78(1946), p. 64-85; E. G. Kraeling, "The Origin of the Name 'Hebrew'," AJSL, 58(1941), pp. 237-253; H. H. Rowley, "Habiru and Hebrew," PEQ, 74(1942), pp. 41-53; esp. idem, From Joseph to Joshua, (London, 1952), pp. 165-188. M. Gray, "The Habiru-Hebrew Problem," HUCA, 29(1958), pp. 135-202; H. Klengel, "Halbnomaden am mittleren Euphrat," Das Altertum, 5(1959), pp. 195-205; M. Rowton, "The Topological Factor in the Hapiru Problem," Studies in Honor of Benno Landsberger, Assyriological Studies 16, (Chicago, 1965), pp. 375-387; R. DeVaux, "Le Problème des Hapiru après quinze années," JNES, 27(1968), pp. 221-228; M. Greenberg, "Hab/piru and Hebrews," WHJP, V. 2, pp. 188-200.

XUM

> found a means of subsistence for themselves and their families by entering a state of dependence in various forms.[112]

Within the successive ethnic movements of various peoples during the period, there continued to be a social class of indigent, migrant peoples mixed with the settled populations. Once the social and political chaos diminished at the end of the millenium they seem to disappear as well. Yet even during the centuries of intense tribal migrations the SA.GAZ can be seen to be an element of the settled rather than the nomadic population. Nearly without exception cities and countries are given as their place of origin; they form special quarters in the city of Aleppo. They are given a city by Amanhatbi of Tusulti (EA, 185, 186); even when they are accused of plundering and burning the cities, their base of operations is not the desert but another city.

The use of the term seems to indicate that one would not wish to be called a SA.GAZ by one's friend. Rival city-heads (hazanu) Shuwardata (Keilah is one of his cities), Milkilu of Gezer, Abdi-Hiba of Jerusalem are at various times allied with one another against a third member. Throughout the shifting alliances, they consistently regard their opponent as a SA.GAZ.[113] To be hostile to Rib-Addi of Gubla is "to become like a SA. GAZ". A difficulty with the Amarna usage is that while in the main the term SA.GAZ is

---

[112] Ibid., p. 88.

[113] EA, 280, 290a, 289, 271.

used in a pejorative sense it is not true in every instance. However, in the mind of Rib-Addi, who can bring no specific charge against Abdi-Asirta or Aziru, the term is charged with political sedition.

Rib-Addi is unable to convince the Pharaoh that his empire was virtually lost because of the hostility of the SA. GAZ people. There were no invading hordes from the desert seizing the cities but a change in political control of the city-states, a change which the Pharaoh felt not worth the bother as long as he continued to receive tribute. It was through political intrigue, intimidation, bribery that the SA. GAZ gained control of a city and its territory.[114] Rib-Addi pleads that law and order could no longer be maintained, that his enemies derived their power from the lawless, rebellious element; even the Pharaoh's regents (hazanu) were joining them.

It is immediately apparent that the SA. GAZ were considered socially inferior. They were dependent and landless. They were displaced from their original social group either voluntarily or not, and they enjoyed no legal status within the extant feudal system. They took what they could get. In this context Rib-Addi's constant reference to Abdi-Asirta as a stray dog

---

114 Harassment of the peasants prevented the harvesting of crops and the fields were abandoned. The technique is common practice for Abdi-Asirta, Aziru, Labaya. Campbell notes that Biridiza's scribe often implies by "harvest" the meaning: "we were not able to pluck the wool". Thus, all forms of peasant economy, even simple sheep herding, were shut down. The peasants would not survive if they remained loyal to the regent; their alternative was to join the SA. GAZ people. Cf. E. F. Campbell, "Shechem in the Amarna Archives", Apud, G. E. Wright, Shechem, (New York, 1965), p. 193, n. 4.

is a rather apt social sobriquet. But to live totally unattached would invite extinction so some adherence to another political authority must be expected. This out-group not based on ethnic, folk or kinship ties would not be any different from the ordinary urban population in that respect but would be different from the in-group because of their legal status and political orientation. The mistaken notion that all SA.GAZ were impoverished may be avoided if one recalls that the regents, chiefs and military aristocracy became SA.GAZ in Syria-Palestine. Any dissident who no longer wished to be under the control of a given ruler could be a SA.GAZ-man. And although Abdi-Asirta and his son Aziru were strong rulers in the eyes of Egypt they could very well be SA.GAZ in the subjective view of Rib-Addi for they stood outside the accepted political procedures of one regency respecting another.

Mendenhall reasons that there are three basic and constitutive factors in the term SA.GAZ: 1) loss of status; one must be ejected, flee or withdraw from the previous group to qualify; 2) twofold loss of status in a legal political community: a) the SA.GAZ no longer feel bound by the customary legal obligations ("they do as they please"), b) they are no longer enjoying the protection and privileges of the society; only force can deal with them; and 3) they are said to use illegitimate force against the demands of the existing political structure.[115]

---

[115] G. Mendenhall, The Tenth Generation, (Baltimore, 1973), pp. 131-135.

4. CANAAN IN THE LATE BRONZE AGE

Despite the major political disturbances in Syria-Palestine during MB the cultural tradition remains fundamentally continuous.[116] However a general deterioration in physical culture occurs between 1500 and 1100 B.C. The upheaval between 1250 and 1150 B.C. reaches from Alalakh to Lachish in which many cities were destroyed, most rebuilt but not immediately nor along the same lines. Glock sees three reasons promoting the political disturbances:

> a. New populations were moving in, for example, Philistines, Sea-Peoples, and Hebrews; b. Habiru and peasants generally were revolting against oppressive social and economic conditions in Canaanite life; c. also, Egypt was unable to police city-state intrigue.[117]

This is the proximate historical setting for the appearance of the new people

---

[116] P. Lapp, "The Conquest of Palestine in the Light of Archaeology," Concordia Theological Monthly 38(1967), p. 295. Also, Kenyon, Amorites, p. 5, states: "This continuity, from the Middle to the Late Bronze Age and into the Iron Age, is of particular importance, for this is the material culture that the Israelites found in the land. It is, moreover, the culture that they to a large degree adopted. One of the major difficulties in establishing the chronology of the entry of the Israelites is that at no point in a single site can one say that the material evidence shows that a new people had arrived."

[117] A. Glock, "Early Israel as the Kingdom of Yahweh," Concordia Theological Monthly, 41(1970), p. 583; also, B. Mazar, "Canaan in the Egyptian New Kingdom Period: The Historical Development," WHJP, Vol. 3, pp. 3-22.

in Palestine, the Israelites.

Following the battle of Kadesh in 1282 the Egyptians confined their interests to Palestine while the Hittites, to their vassalages in Syria. The Philistine incursion effected a change in the political domination of the old Canaanite city-state system; as with other groups throughout this millenium, the Philistines do not seem to constitute a racially pure stock.[118] They appear in opposition to the Israelites on political, cultural and religious levels but not ethnic or linguistic. Wright suggests that they were Egyptian mercenaries that became the dominant group in the wake of Egyptian loss of control.[119] The Transjordan was settled during the early 13th century by peoples that came to be known as Moabites, Edomites, Ammonites and Amorites. By the time the Israelites encounter them they are powerful and prosperous kingdoms filled with cities, villages and strong political systems. Their relation to a previous nomadic clan associated with the territory, the Horites, is obscure; likewise, their place of origin, their manner of

---

[118] The contrast between Israelite and Philistine on the basis of circumcision is not racial but religious as the narrative Joshua 5:2-9 would suggest. Cf. also, R. D. Barnett, The Sea Peoples, CAH, Vol. 2, ch. 28, 1969; A. Malamat, "The Egyptian Decline in Canaan and the Sea Peoples," WHJP, Vol. 3, pp. 23-38.

[119] G. E. Wright, "Philistine Coffins and Mercenaries," The Biblical Archaeologist Reader, 2, pp. 59-69; H. E. Kassis, "Gath and the Structure of 'Philistine' Society", JBL, 84 (1965), pp. 259-271.

arrival and previous social organization.[120] Suffice it to say that these peoples were part of the migratory groups which originated in northern Syria and Anatolia in the Late Bronze Age.

What took place between the Amarna period and the time of the Israelite occupation has become the subject of several hypotheses.[121] Albrecht Alt working from the method of the history of territorial divisions began with this principle: territorial divisions in a country are always conservative, changes in political and economic relationship even in population, "can at most modify only details but not fundamentally alter the larger or smaller units or their delimitation".[122] The political form of pre-Israelite Canaan

---

[120] Cf. N. Glueck, "Explorations in Eastern Palestine, II," AASOR, 15 (1935). pp. 321-330; idem, "Surface Finds in Edom and Moab," PEQ, 71 (1939), pp. 188-192; idem, "Some Ancient Towns in the Plains of Moab," BASOR 91 (1943), pp. 7-26; idem, "The Civilization of the Edomites," BA, 10 (1947), pp. 77-84; idem, "The Civilization of the Edomites," BAR, II, pp. 51-58; idem, "Explorations in the Land of Ammon," BASOR 68 (1937), pp. 13-21; idem, "The Civilization of the Moabites," AJA, 38 (1934), pp. 212-218; S. Cohen, "Edom", IDB, II, pp. 24-26; J. R. Bartlett, "The Rise and Fall of the Kingdom of Edom," PEQ, 104 (1972), pp. 26-37; E. D. Grohman, "Moab", IDB, III, pp. 409-419; G. M. Landes, "The Material Civilization of the Ammonites," BAR, II, pp. 69-88.

[121] The most recent thorough discussion of the positions of the Alt-Noth, Albright, and Mendenhall may be found in M. Weippert's Master's thesis of 1965, Die Landnahme der israelitischen Stämme in der neuren wissenschaftlichen Diskussion, (Göttingen, 1967) now in English translation, The Settlement of the Israelite Tribes in Palestine: A Critical Survey of Recent Scholarly Debate. Studies in Biblical Theology, series 2, no. 21 (Naperville, Ill., 1972). Hereafter cited as: Weippert, Settlement. Cf. A. Alt, Essays, pp. 133-169; M. Noth, History of Israel, pp. 72ff.

[122] Weippert, Settlement, p. 7.

XUM

was the city-state system as those attested to in the Amarna correspondence. These city-states were well established in the plains but the literature shows few in the central hill country and thus the territories in the plains were relatively smaller than those of the uplands. Israelite tribes settled peacefully in the gaps in the city-state system; fundamental then is the concept that seminomads subsisting on the fringe between cultivated lands and non-arable soil, herding small cattle from winter to summer pastures gradually settled in the uninhabited and uncontested land. The campaigns of Joshua must be understood as aetiological narratives rather than history in the proper sense.[123] Martin Noth elaborated in his commentary on the book of Joshua that the historicity of an aetiological narrative is suspect if not totally lacking because the purpose of the story is to explain a present condition in terms of a past historical event which in turn is inconsistent with other reliable testimony. The prime example is the destruction of Ai; archaeology has made clear that Ai was uninhabited at the time of its supposed capture by Joshua.[124]

Noth views the settlement to have taken place in two phases: 1) The "Leah" tribes of Reuben, Simeon, Levi, Judah, Zebulun and Issachar

---

[123] Cf. B. Long, The Problem of Etiological Narrative in the Old Testament, BZAW, 108, 1968. See also J. Bright's criticism of Alt-Noth methodology, in particular, the historicity to be given an aetiological story, in Early Israel in Recent History Writing, Studies in Biblical Theology, 19, (London, 1960), pp. 34-55.

[124] Noth, Josua, pp. 43-51.

gained a footing in Palestine early in the central land west of the Jordan. 2) The "Rachel" tribes of Joseph, Benjamin, Dan, Gad, Asher and Naphtali came later displacing Reuben, Simeon and Levi from their territory and expanding the total land occupied to include portions of the Transjordan.[125] He soberly states that one cannot make a firm conclusion from the biblical data as to the process of entry, movement and final settlement of the tribes. It is apparent that conflict and congestion must have occurred from the virtual disappearance of Reuben, the exclusion of Simeon to the far southern fringe, the landlessness of Levi, the inability of Dan to gain a foothold in the central country, the splitting of the house of Joseph, the indentured status of Issachar. He remarks:

> But we know enough to infer that the individual tribes each had their own particular prehistory and that their mutual relationships were at best loose and fluid before they entered into a solid and lasting association one with another on the soil of Palestine under the collective name of Israel.[126]

---

[125] Idem, The History of Israel, rev. ed. trans. fr. German by P. Ackroyd, (New York, 1960), pp. 85-89; idem, Das System der zwölf Stämme Israels. (Stuttgart, 1930); idem, "The Homes of the Tribes in Palestine," Old Testament Issues, (New York, 1968), ed. S. Sandmel, pp. 121-156. Mowinckel advances a ten tribe system in his article, "Rahelstämme and Leastämme," BZAW 77 (1958), pp. 136-150; G. A. Barton, JBL, 48 (1929), pp. 144-148; J. Liver, "The Israelite Tribes," WHJP, Vol. 3, pp. 183-211. Contra Noth, see H. M. Orlinsky, "The Tribal System of Israel and Related Groups in the Period of the Judges," Oriens Antiquus, (1962), pp. 11-20.

[126] Ibid., p. 72.

W. F. Albright outlined his hypothesis in 1939 working closely with the archaeological data on the one hand and assuming the historicity of the text on the other.[127] Primary historical documents (extra-Biblical documents and inscriptions) are of the greatest value in reconstructing the period; on this Albright and Noth agree. Secondary documents (Biblical records) are a different story; Noth prefers to read them with particular attention to their literary history and form. Albright while acknowledging the value of literary criticism would prefer not to devalue a priori the historical value of a text: it is reliable until proven otherwise. The archaeological evidence can shed a minimum of light on Israelite history because it is "silent" evidence according to Noth. It may illuminate a general situation but it can never prove a particular event. Albright prefers to dovetail "internal" evidence, i.e., written traditions, with "external" evidence to better determine the chronology of the events.

---

127 W. F. Albright, "The Israelite Conquest of Canaan in the Light of Archaeology," BASOR, 74 (1939), pp. 11-23. Idem., From the Stone Age to Christianity, (Garden City, 1957), pp. 49-64; P. Lapp, CTM 38 (1967), pp. 283-300. Cf. also, G. E. Wright, "Epic of the Conquest," BA 3 (1940), pp. 25-40; idem, Biblical Archaeology, (Philadelphia, 1957), pp. 69-84. The position of Y. Aharoni is substantially that of Albright, Lapp and Wright, cf. "Problems of the Israelite Conquest in the Light of Archaeological Discoveries," Antiquity and Survival 2 (1957), pp. 131-150; idem, "The Settlement of Canaan," WHJP Vol. 3, pp. 94-128; idem, "New Aspects of the Israelite Occupation in the North," NEA in the 20th Century, pp. 254-265; also the recent work of S. Yeivin, The Israelite Conquest of Canaan, Publications de l'Institute historique et archéologique néerlandais de Stamboul, XXVII, 1971 who posits that the first phase was the infiltration by Ashur and Naphtali before 1600 B. C. followed by "Leah" and "Rachel" tribes. A most welcome essay on the judicious application of archaeological data to biblical traditions is that of R. DeVaux, "On Right and Wrong Uses of Archaeology," NEA in the 20th Century, pp. 64-80.

XUM

Lapp is confident that through archaeological data a better understanding of historical groups such as the Israelites, Philistines, Canaanites and their political, economic and cultural life may be gained. Evidence indicates that prior to the Philistine arrival (dated through pottery) a severe destruction took place at Lachish, Hazor, and Debir that required a concerted effort on the part of a large group of well-organized people. Thus the bibilical traditions need not be devalued with respect to their historical probability.[128] Although the debate between the German and American scholars has tended to sharply define their lines of disagreement, both are open to the developments of literary criticism and new finds in the field of excavations; in fact, the debate deals more with methodology than data.

The sociological solution that completes the current spectrum of hypotheses is that of George Mendenhall.[129] The settlement of the Israelites was

---

[128] Lapp, CTM 38 (1967), pp. 297-300.

[129] The brief exposition of his proposal may be found in BA, 25 (1962), pp. 66-87. A far more complete study may be found in his recent work, The Tenth Generation cited above. Cf. also Frick, The City, pp. 210ff.; Glock, Warfare, cited in n. 79 above; J. T. Luke, Pastoralism and Politics in the Mari Period: A Re-Examination of the Character and Political Significance of the Major West Semitic Tribal Groups on the Middle Euphrates, ca. 1828-1758, unpublished Ph.D dessertation, University of Michigan, 1965; S. H. Bess, Systems of Land Tenure in Ancient Israel, unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Michigan, 1963; also, J. L. McKenzie, The World of the Judges, pp. 95-98, concurs with Mendenhall (with reservations).

XUM

never a Landnahme but a change of domain, a new system of land tenure.[130] In the old feudal system, occupancy of the land was always related to the king or his vassal in one way or another, the bond was economic; in the new social order, Yahweh was the lord of the land, Israel his tenant and the bond was ethical, regulated by covenant.

Mendenhall strives to understand the radical rejection of Canaanite religious and political ideologies. Unlike the two previous responses, he turns to extrabiblical disciplines such as social anthropology and comparative philology for aid. In essense, he writes that there is more than one reliable way of approaching biblical history.[131]

The data thus far presented in this study tends to agree with Mendenhall's analysis. If Israelite roots are to be found in both the Canaanite city-state system and in the rural, migrant, tribal milieu,[132] then one should analyze the city texts of the Yahwist with these factors in mind.

The political turmoil witnessed in the Amarna letters did not conclude with the last datable tablet, but continued until the unification of the land

---

130 Cf. M. E. Bellefontaine, A Study of Ancient Israelite Laws and Their Function as Covenant Stipulations, unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Notre Dame, 1973, pp. 175-200. Cf. also, K. H. Henrey, "Land Tenure in the Old Testament," PEQ 86 (1954), pp. 5-15.

131 Mendenhall, Generation, p.2.

132 In a similar manner one may read Frick, The City, p. 211.

by David. To call the Israelite settlement a "peasants' revolt" on the analogy of a much later event in German history may seem to overstate the biblical event.[133] Defections from the political rule in Canaan during the 14th century in the form of cities and lands joining the SA.GAZ included members from every class of society. Likewise, in these times, it is likely that new patrons vied with established (legal) ones for peasant support and produce; a patron whose star was on the decline would lose his clients to one whose star was in ascendancy. For revolt, a common cause and condition was needed. In such times of political stress the opportunity was present - and as Amarna portrays, was activated - for peasants to form coalitions. A major difference in the Amarna documents and those of early Israel is the lack of a tribal consciousness in the early 14th century and the marked awareness of it during the period of the Judges. A social and political transformation had occurred during the hiatus.

Seti I, Ramses II, and Merneptah attempted to reassert effective political domination in Canaan following the Amarna period. Their limited successes at Beth-shan, Kadesh, and Shechem and withdrawal subsequent to the arrival of the Sea-Peoples leaves considerable room for local developments. It is Mendenhall's contention that the Israelite settlement and the SA.GAZ movement of Amarna materials are one and the same political process, not necessarily violent but potentially so in certain cases.[134] Account

---

133 Mendenhall, Conquest, p. 73.

134 This would satisfy the Alt-Noth belief that it was peaceful and Lapp's need to explain the destruction of specific sites.

must be taken of two factors in a peasant-based revolt: the peasant's tendency towards autonomy, and an equally strong tendency to form coalitions on a more or less unstable basis for short-range ends.[135] It may not be difficult to arouse a peasant group to common action but it is arduous to maintain organization while in action and after the short term goal is achieved. Thus local periodic irruptions might continue over a long period of time without uniting into a major force for lack of a catalyst.

Racial distinction is a relatively modern notion that has come about since the rise of nationalism. A cluster of families may constitute a clan with its specific village center. Several clans would comprise a tribe

---

[135] Autonomy should not be taken in terms of the American Declaration of Independence but rather freedom from oppressive demands on his funds of rent and subsistence. Karl Marx for all his love of the proletarian was a realist when it came to ensuring peasant support; they must be led and represented by someone outside their class. The revolt Mendenhall speaks of is not a Marxist revolt but many elements are similar. Cf. E. R. Wolf, Peasants, (Englewood Cliffs, N.J., 1966), pp. 91-92.

with a territorial center in some major city within its boundaries.[136] Clearly, a tribe would not be a racially pure group but simply an administrative unit within a federation of tribes. Noth is probably correct in assuming a prehistory for a tribe prior to incorporation but this prehistory need not demand either ethnic purity nor nomadic origin. Again, Alt may be quite accurate in his concept of the territorial division as a constant, for what had transpired was a change in political and social structure from the city-state to tribal, but not a change of racially diverse population associated with cosmopolitan urban centers to racially new and pure groups haunting the uninhabited.

If one accepts the tribe as a social and administrative unit within a given territory which in turn is populated with cities and their villages, one may also conceive that a network of kinship ties between the urban group and those of the villages, through marriage or migration, might be maintained. However, the symbiosis between town and village would be disrupted if an external superior power group assumed control as the Sea-Peoples did in the

---

136 Cf. C. U. Wolf, "Terminology of Israel's Tribal Organization," JBL 65 (1946), pp. 45-49; idem, "Some Remarks on the Tribes and Clans of Israel," JQR 36 (1946), pp. 287-295; J. H. Chamberlayne, "Kinship Relations among the Early Hebrews," Numen 10 (1963), pp. 153-164. A. Causse views the Hebrew invasion clashing with urban culture of Canaan producing a crisis for kinship relations among the Israelites, cf., "La crise de la solidarité de famille et de clan dans l'ancien Israël," Revue d'Histoire de la Philosophie Religieuse 10 (1930), pp. 24-60. Cf. also, B.S.J. Isserlin, "Israelite and Pre-Israelite Place-Names in Palestine," PEQ 89 (1957), pp. 133-144. See also M. O. Sahlins, Tribesmen (Englewood Cliffs, N.J., 1968), 4-13, concerning the social and political roles of tribes.

XUM

13th and 12th centuries. Gen. 34 relates the blunder of a city prince violating a village maiden with the resultant havoc among the men of the village. Tribal formation may have come about as a result of sufficient numbers defecting from the cities with their military aristocracies; cities formed their own coalitions as Joshua 10 would indicate. They needed a similar alliance to cope with the Gibeonite treaty.[137] The military aristocracies met with their technologically inferior foe but lost to their wiliness. The Israelites possessed little military and technological power but the traditions stress that they had an unparalleled unity of ethical cohesion.

It must be emphasized that the kingship ideal of divine origin was shared by Canaan with its neighbors.[138] The success of political and military power introduced into the city-state of Canaan a twofold disruption which was operative both in the ideology of the conqueror and that of the conquered. The most important deity is that which underwrites the legitimacy of those in power, and received sufficient popular allegiance. A deity without a social following is at best effete. As it has been pointed out with regard to Mesopotamia, the pantheon reflects the political structure of the state

---

137 B. D. Rathjen, "Philistine and Hebrew Amphictyonies," INES 24(1965), pp. 100-104.

138 Cf. J. Gray, "Canaanite Kingship in Theory and Practice," VT 2(1952), pp. 193-220. The author demonstrates the distinctiveness of Canaanite kingship in the midst of her most powerful rivals; however, he is also wedded to a naive anthropology that conceives of primitive tribal societies supplying fresh blood to Canaanite culture through continuous incursions from the desert.

and supports the status quo. The reciprocity involved subjects the gods to state manipulation. Aspects of the deities which were unpredictable become regulated through incarnation in the king and institutionalization in the priesthood. The Israelite movement was a radical rejection of this ideology; it proclaimed Yahweh as one, as king, as lord of the land, as judge, and as warrior; all were functions of the Canaanite aristocracy. The Israelites believed that political realities were a function of the religious ethic and not the exercise of the monopoly of force.[139] It is Mendenhall's thesis that

> the biblical covenant was a systematic proclamation that no one was in control, and any social organization was a secular business that depended entirely upon its demonstrated value to human beings - and its willingness to remain within the ethical bonds to which all members of the community were obligated.[140]

The catalyst for mobilizing the large social units disaffected with Canaanite society was a band of immigrants, surely smaller in number than those native to the land but great enough to exert sufficient pressure. Thus the new forces were made up of a cross section of Canaanites (within this term must be grouped all smaller political and religious groups) predominantly of the lower classes (but not exclusively), some from the cities

---

[139] Mendenhall, Generation, p. 193.

[140] Ibid., p. 195. This is a harsh criterion if applied to the monarchy. However, if it was the underlying factor in the formation of the tribal confederacy, then it is easy to believe that the monarchy would be judged by someone at sometime during its history.

the others from the villages, joined with a mixed group that migrated north along the eastern side of the Dead Sea bearing a fierce devotion to their god Yahweh and a vivid memory of what he had done for them in the Sinai and in Egypt. The new faith was not something worked out over the next two centuries following entry but appeared compact and fully developed from the start.[141]

SUMMARY

It is a fact that urban culture during the third and second millenia suffered an ebb and flow pattern corresponding to the power of the current political regime. The periods of decline saw the influx of new peoples, and the times of rise, a strengthening of power. Urban-centered feudalism was the dominant social and political form that gave shape to the society throughout the second millenium. The Israelite movement is better characterized as a repudiation of the feudal system than a land appropriation by land-hungry nomads. The enmity between the Israelites and the Canaanites did not originate in the age-old hostility between the nomad and the sedentary farmer, but a grass roots polarization between groups within the society. The coalition that was successful in establishing a new order in Palestine

---

[141] McKenzie, Judges, p. 98; cf. also, R. T. Anderson, "The Role of the Desert in Israelite Thought," JBR, 27(1959), pp. 41-44.

based on religious and ethical unity, i.e., a value system that transcended the old was that described above.[142]

By the time of the writing of the J corpus a new crisis had arisen: the Solomonic kingdom had become old Canaan reincarnated. The social conditions and religious cults that had been present in the 12th century had returned and prompted another revolution, this time the separation of Israel from Judah.

---

142 It cannot be emphasized too strongly that "religion and politics are reciprocals" and operative in the formation of the new social order. It might be argued that the Israel of the Merenptah stele was a social class, a group as yet unleavened. Following the disruption of the Sea-Peoples and the subsequent invasion of Yahwism, Israel became a people. Cf. E.A. Speiser, "'People' and 'Nation' of Israel," JBL, 79(1960), pp. 157-163.

CHAPTER THREE

URBAN CIVILIZATION IN THE YAHWIST CORPUS

Thus far attention has been directed to an analysis of the dimensions of the literary corpus of J, the processes of urbanization, the rise and significance of the city in Mesopotamian and Egyptian sources, and finally the manifold skeins of social, political and historical trends in Canaan during the millenium preceding the rise of the Davidic monarchy. The task in this chapter is to examine those portions of the Yahwist writings which shed the most light on J's attitude toward urban civilization. Of particular interest will be the Cain and Abel narrative in Gen. 4:1-16, the Cainite and Sethite genealogies of Gen. 4:17-26, 5:29, the story of Babel in 11:1-9, the narratives dealing with Lot 13:2-13 and the destruction of Sodom 18-19:28.

A. NARRATIVES CONCERNING CAIN: GENESIS 4:1-26

While all of chapter four has been given to J by most commentators, most admit that the material is not entirely from the same hand. Eissfeldt sees the "L" strand in vss. 1, 17a, 18-24, Fohrer gives vss. 17-24 to the "N" stratum.[1] The remainder of the verses 2-16, 25-26, are allocated to J (J^2 in Simpson. In contrast to these analyses, it is the view of the present study

[1] Cf. the discussion of Eissfeldt and Fohrer above pp. 5-10. Recall that while Eissfeldt and Simpson (J^1) regard L as the oldest literary layer Fohrer would place N's date between J and E.

that the evidence supports the conclusion that J does reflect other tendencies and multiple oral sources but not sufficiently to posit a totally new written source. An alternative view is offered in this analysis.

1. LITERARY CRITICISM

If one assumes that vs. 1 of chapter four is vs. 1, then one perceives a pattern repeated in 17a, 25-26; 5:29; 29:32; 30:5-8, 10-13, 17-21, 23-24, which deserves attention.[2] The verbal phrase ויהר ותלד occurs in the leading clause in each of these verses. The pattern as found in 4:1 has this structure:

a b c d e
And Adam knew his wife Eve and she conceived

f g h
and bore Cain saying:

'g'
"I have gotten a man [with the help of Yahweh"]

a) husband b) "knew" c) "his wife" d) name of the wife e) "and she conceived" f) "and bore" g) name of the son h) "saying"; a quotation from the mother's lips follows which includes: a) a verb explaining through assonance the child's name 'g', b) the name of the deity and c) an explanatory clause which closes the verse [ ].

---

[2]The illuminating analysis of J. Fichtner, "Die etymologische Ätiologie in dem Namengebungen der geschichtlichen Bücher des Alten Testaments," VT 6(1956), pp. 372-396, is a model study in form-criticism in this area. Cf. also, A. Key, "The Giving of Proper Names in the Old Testament," JBL 83(1964), pp. 55-59. With respect to suggestions regarding the verse sequence see H. Zeydner, "Kainszeichen Keniter Beschneidung," ZAW 18(1898), pp. 120-125; also, Skinner, Genesis, p. 99.

XUM

In vs. 25 a new phrase "...a son/and she called his name"/ maybe represented as f1 and f2. Thus a schematic of the verses might be shown in this manner:

4:1 a-b-c-d-e-f-g-h:

'g' -[YWH]

17: a-b-c-(d)-e-f-g-(h):

(direct quotation missing)

25: a-b-c-(d-e)-f-f1-f2-g-(h):

'g' ELHM [ ]

26: a1(b-c-d-e)-f-f1-f2-g-(h):

(direct quotation missing)

5:29: (a-(b-c-d-e)-f supplied from 5:28) f1-f2-g-h:

'g' [ ]YWH

29:32: (a-b-c) d-e-f-f1-f2-g-h:

YWH, 'g',[ ].

33: (a-b-c) d-e-f-f1-f2-g-h:

YWH 'g' [ ]

34 (a-b-c) d-e-f-f1:

'g'[ ]-f2-g

35 (a-b-c) d-e-f-f1:

'g' YWH, f2-g [ ]

30:5-6: (a-b-c) d1-e-f-a1-f1, d-h:

ELHM, 'g'[ ] - f2-g

7-8: (a-b-c) d1-e-f-f1-a1, d-h:

ELHM, 'g1', 'g2'[ ]f2-g.

10-11: a-b-(c)-d1(-e)-d2-d-f-a 1-f1, d-h:

'g' -f2-g.

12-13: (a-b-c)e-d1-d2-f-f1-a1, d-h:

'g1' ['g2'] -f2-g.

17-18: ELHM (a-b-c)-d-e-f-a1-f1-, d-h:

ELHM, 'g1' ['g2'] -f2-g.

19-20: (a-b-c)-d-e-f-a1-f1, d-h:

ELHM, 'g1' ['g2'] [ ]-f2-g.

21: (a-b-c)-d-(e)-f-f1-f2-g.

23-24: (a-b-c)-d-e-f-f1-h:

ELHM, 'g1' -f2-g-h:

YWH, 'g2'.

The exception which proves the rule occurs in 21:2-3 which is taken from P but bears the semblance of J's pattern:

2: (a-b-c)-d-e-f-a1-f1 [...ELHM...].

3: a-f2-f1-() [d-f-a1]-g.

21:1b-5 is a P addition which replaces the birth of Isaac in J and E as Noth remarks,[3] however, the J basis is apparent in 2a as well as 1a. The pattern becomes hopelessly lost in adverbial phrases, repetitious clauses until the name is given. Similar to Gen. 21-2-3 in that the father names the child is I Chron. 7:23 wherein the sequence is as follows:

---

[3] Noth, Pentateuch, pp. 28-29, n. 88.

(a-b) c (d) e-f-f1-f2-g (h):

['g'].

Lacking in the passage is any mention of a deity. There is but one other instance in the Old Testament in which the pattern apparently occurs. viz., I Sam. 1: 19b-20. I Sam. 1-4:1 is commonly considered as coming from the Late Source, however, this is perhaps a fine example of earlier material being reworked by the later editor. The verses are:

19b: b-a-d-c |YWH|;

20: [ ] e-d-f-f1-f2-g- [h-'g' - YWH]

The word order is jumbled in 19b but all the elements are present; "And Yahweh remembered her" is a parenthetical phrase similar to Gen. 30:22 in reference to Rachel (probably from E). The phrase "and in due time" may be transferred to the beginning of vs. 21 as Kittel suggests; except for the exchange of position between e and d, vs. 20 reads as Gen. 29:32-33. כי introduces the explanatory clause in 20b as in Gen. 4:25; 29:32-34; 30:13; the divine name is present in its accustomed place; however, a real departure occurs in the verbal explanation of the child's name. Whereas all previous instances show an assonantal relationship, this does not. A later editor has given a verbal play on the name of Saul, not Samuel, in שאלתיו. Thus, in I Sam. 1: 19b-20 one sees an early form, the core of the pattern, reworked by an editor less familiar with it and/or more concerned with the expression of how Hannah came to bear Samuel with the help of Yahweh.

One may argue that this pattern is never followed in 29:32-35 and 30:5-6ff because the a-b-c element is lacking save v. 10 which the LXX supplies.

The objection may be true and another pattern B should be designated in view of the several shifts. One notices that from 29:34 on g has been removed to the climactic position of last (the exception in the conflated 23-24 which with respect to 23 it is last and with respect to 24 it is as in 29:32-33). Beginning with 30:5-6, h introduces the quotation from the same verse and is used of the legal mother at all times. Also, the explanatory clause contains a second play on the name (in v. 20 a second explanatory clause is inserted). Vs. 21 is puzzling because of its brevity but what there is adheres to the pattern seen also in 38:3-5, especially in vs. 5.

In view of this evidence it would be difficult to agree with Eissfeldt that 4:1, 17a are not from the same source as vss. 25, 26; 5:29; 29:32-35; 30:5-8, 10-13, 17-21, 23-24. Fohrer assigns the entire material to J save 17a which he includes with N; however, Fohrer does not demonstrate that 17a is only imitative of the J pattern. Therefore, it should be retained in J. The euphemistic use of ידע is peculiar to J in the Hexateuch as may be seen in 4:1, 17, 25; 19:5, 8; 24:16; 38:26; P uses it in the same sense in Nu 31:17, 18, 35 but always accompanied by the clarifying אשה ידעת איש למשכב ; the mother names the child in 4:1, 25; 29:32, 33, 34, 35; 30:6, 8, 11,13,18,20,21,23,24; 38:3, 4,5.;[4]

---

[4] In J the female slave does not name her children: an angel tells Hagar 16:11; while there are many allusions to the meaning of Isaac's name in J in terms of Sarah's laughter the account of her naming the child is lost, P places it in the mouth of God in 17:19; 25:25 relates the etymology of Esau and Jacob but the insertion in 26b leaves the namer in doubt; 38:3-5 in LXX consistently has the mother bestow the name, the MT only in vss. 4 and 5.

exceptions would be 4:26 and Ex. 2:22 (in 5:29 the lost J portion of the verse contained the giver of the name, P has corrected ותקרא to ויקרא perhaps to make it accord with 5:28). Another feature initiated in vs. 1 is the derivation of the name from the sound of the verb in the quotation found successively in 4:25; 5:29; 29:32, 33,34,35; 30:6, 8, 11, 13, 18, 20, 23, 24; Ex. 2:10.

Ex. 2:2a and 2:10b were originally a unit but an elaborate narrative explaining why a Hebrew child received an Egyptian name with a Hebrew etymology has been inserted from 2:2b to 2:10a with marvelous skill. An example of contrasting styles for handling the same material may be seen in Ex. 2:22 in J ((a-b-c)d (e)-f-f1-f2-g-h: 'g'),[5] and 18:3-4 in E ((a-b-c-d-e-f)-f1-f2-g-h: 'g'; (a-b-c-d-e-f-f1) g(h): 'g' ().).

The pattern in Gen. 4:17 is complete through g but lacking in the rest which supports the opinion that 17b is a corruption or substitution (Gunkel). The literary pattern of 18-22 is quite different from vss. 1, 17a, 25 and 26. The laconic notice that to Enoch was born Irad, and to Irad, Methujael, etc., is closer to 10:8; 22:20-24; and 25:1-4. It would require radical emendation to bring 18-20 into line with 1, 17a and 25 whereas it would not to homologize 17b with 17a. Thus the verse originally would have been completed with a quotation from Cain's wife explaining the son's name, Enoch. It might have read:

"And Cain knew his wife_____and she

---

[5] The Peshitta and Vulgate add a second son from 18:4.

conceived and bore Enoch saying:

"He is the founder of a city, thus the

city is called, Enoch".

17a וידע קין את-אשתו ותהר ותלד את-חנוך

17b ויהי חנך כי יקרא שם העיר חנוך

The restored line would emend בנה to חנך, builder to founder in 17ab, would begin 17bb with כי as in 4:25; 29:32, 33, 34; 30: 13, would eliminate the second explanatory clause כשם בני inserted between העיר and חנוך. Budde had emended כשם בני to כשמו to read: he became a town builder, and called the name of the city after his own name Enoch. While this alleviates the ambiguity of who built the city it does not satisfy two conditions of the established pattern 1) the verbal play on the son's name, and 2) that the latter half of the distich be a quotation from the mother (but not necessarily). In addition the restored line would equally link vs. 1 to vs. 25 and vs. 17 to 18-22. But the redactor did not see fit to leave it this way.

The Sethite genealogy in J is contained in the truncated list of 4:25-26.[6]

---

[6] Noth's view that vss. 25-26 are a gloss on 5:3, 6 by a scribe desirous of smoothing out the tension between 4:1, 2a and 5:3 raises more questions than it resolves. There is no certain way to pre-date 5:3 before 4:25 from the text. It may be admitted that 5 contains an ancient list in P imitative of the Sumerian King List, but this does not provide a handle for comparative dating and dependency. He has left 25-26 to neither J no P but to an obscure redactor. Cf. S. Sandmel, "Genesis 4:26b," Two Living Traditions, Essays on Religion and Bible, (Detroit, 1972), pp. 305-315.

The pattern in vs. 25 is substantially that of vs. 1 save the lack of the wife's name (d) which is true of vs. 17, 25;5:29; 30:21; 38:3-5; Ex. 2:2, the phrase "she conceived" also missing in vss. 26; 5:29; 30:10, 21; 38:5, and the final ויקרא also lacking in vss. 17, 26; 29:34, 35; 30:21; 38:3-5. That the LXX was aware of the full pattern is apparent here in vs. 25: καὶ συλλαβοῦσα ἔτεκεν υἱὸν again in 30:10 καὶ συνέλαβεν 30:12 καὶ συνέλαβεν . The presence of אלהים may be studied usage in view of the significance of vs. 26; on the other hand J is not adverse to using it alone as in 3:1b, 3, 5, and 6 prior to chapter four and its selected use as an appellative rather than a proper name is consistent in J.[7]

The pattern is seemingly disrupted in v. 26 from the start with the indirect ולשת (a1) but one immediately notices that this is the favored manner in 30:5, 7, 10, 12, 17, 19; the LXX adds τῷ Ἰακώβ in 29:32, 33. The form ילד-בן is unique and suggests the expression in P:5:5, 7, 10, 14, 16, 20, 22, 26, 28 and 31: וידלד בנים (but וידלד-בן in vs. 28); nevertheless the sequence in 4:26 is nearer to J than any verse in P and one must incline toward J as 5:28b is pivotal between P and J. The following expressions "a son (f1) and he called his name (f2)" are already found in vss. 25; 5:28bb-29aa; 29:32, 33; but separated in 29:34, 35 and throughout 30:5-24. The son's name, Enosh (g), follows unaccompanied by (h) for there is no direct quotation to follow. The tendentious announcement that with Enosh, man began to use the name (i.e. worship) Yahweh breaks

---

[7] Cf. Noth, Pentateuch pp. 23-25.

the supposed play on the name Enosh. It would seem that all of 26b is an interpolation reminiscent of or foreshadowing 12:8; 13:4; 21:33; 26:25. There is a slim connection between Enosh as the first believer in Yahweh and the preceding series of firsts in 17-22.

Some conclusions and suggestions are in order. The author of vs. 1 must also be that of 17a and 25, although 25 includes the variations of f1 and f2. Evidence of editorial activity may be seen in 17b, 25b ("for Cain slew him"), and 26. The bare bones of the pattern are present in 26a but 26b appears as a later addition. The J fragment in 5:29 is related in structure to 4:25; the absence of a-f must be expected because of its accomodation to the P style in 5:28-30. If וילד בן (5:28) has been substituted for ותלד בן in 4:25, in view of P's preference for father's naming of the child, then one might suppose the Yahwistic form of the verse would have been:

"and Lamech again knew his wife_____
and she conceived and bore a son,
and she called his name Noah saying:
'This one shall comfort us from our work
and from the toil of our hands
from the ground which Yahweh cursed'."

It is that portion of the pattern left untouched by P in 5:29 which gives the clue to restoration. The literary pattern of 4:18-22 is continued in 9:20a from which this restoration may be offered:

"And_____ bore Noah,

A man of the earth who planted a vineyard."

Thus the fragment in 5:29 would seem to belong to 4:1, 17a, 25-26. It cannot be determined beyond a doubt as to which genealogy 5:29 belongs; P has placed all in the Sethite line and that is where one finds Lamech and Noah, yet in J the Cainite genealogy seems distinct from the Sethite and an attribution to one or the other seems arbitrary at this point. The message of 5:29b is closer to 3:17 than 4:11 but may not be unrelated to 4:2-16 in that 4:2-16 has been worked into the concerns of Gen. 2-3 by J. The verse does not state that Noah was the first to do anything but that his work would offer a respite from the consequences of the curse in 3:18-19.

With the aid of 29:32-30:24 one may say that in Gen. 4 three parts are visible: a) 1, 17a, 17b, 25, 26 and 5:29; b) 2-16; and c) 18-22 (23-24). Commentators are wary of giving all of 29:32-30:24 unreservedly to J. Noth feels that the redactor used J as a basis but used E in the case of etymologies "at the expense of J".[8] But one must say the same of 4:1, 25; and 5:29 if etymologies are the trait of E in popular genealogies. The doublets in 30:8, 13, 18, 20 and 24 may be a conflation of JE or may simply be variants within J. Von Rad concludes that J and E are so skillfully interwoven here that the passage defies intelligible separation. Nothing can be decided on the basis of the divine name; the stylistic preference of E for אמה and J for שפחה remains the only sure criterion for separation.[9] Nevertheless source separation

---

[8] Noth, Pentateuch, p. 29, n. 94.

[9] A. Jepsen, "Amah" und Schiphschah", VT 8(1958), pp. 293-297; idem, "Amah und Schiphschah-Nachtrag V.T. VIII 3," VT 8(1958), p. 425.

remains a knotty problem.[10] Lehming has suggested that the oldest narrative in 29:31-30:24 originated in the territory of the house of Joseph, had as its purpose to relate the birth of Joseph beginning with the conflict arising between the fruitful but unloved Leah and the barren but loved Rachel.[11] A later editor of the house of Joseph, stimulated by the theme of rivalry, added secular etymologies for Issachar and others, and finally a J redactor brought the profane etymologies into line with belief in Yahweh and sought to relate the southern tribes to the etymology of the name of Joseph. The description of the Traditionsgeschichte accord well with its linguistic similarities with chapter 4. The final impress of the J redactor is revealed in the repetitive pattern outlined above.

The evidence indicates that the core of the pattern was:

I. (the father) knew his wife (name)
and she conceived and bore (name) saying:
(verbal phrase explaining the name)

II. (the mother's name) conceived and bore a son, and said:
(verbal play on the name with a divine subject)

The redactional features would then be

I. .....a son and she called his name...
.....(explanatory clause)

---

[10] Cf. H. Cazelles, Pentateuque, cols. 774-775.

[11] S. Lehming, "Zur Erzählung von der Geburt der Jacobsöhne," VT 13(1963), pp. 74-81.

4:1 "with the help of Yahweh"

4:25 "instead of Abel whom Cain slew"

5:29 "from the ground which Yahweh cursed". etc.

II. ....female slave of..... to Jacob ....

second etymology, second explanatory clause,

and perhaps the displacement of "therefore she

called him by the name"... (name).

Then one may believe that 4:1, 17a, 25abd were earlier than 4:1bb, 17b, 25bb, 26; 5:29bb. Strictly speaking the core formula is undatable because it offers no handles for dating. The redactor of ch. 4 and 29-30 may be placed from the concerns which he expresses: 1) that the Lord of Life is Yahweh, 2) that present tensions among the tribal divisions are long-standing but may be resolved through Yahweh's help, and 3) that the union of the southern and northern tribes has been foreshadowed with the birth of Joseph. This would make the united monarchy the probable time of the redaction when theological undergirding for the union of Israel and Judah needed expression.

Ch. 4:2-16 comprises an uneven unit whose existence was already known to the redactor of 4:25bb.[12] The Cain and Abel story is a narrative that must have enjoyed a long oral history prior to incorporation by J into the Urgeschichte. It would seem likely that originally a different account of the birth of Cain

[12] Cf. O. R. Sellers, "Problems in the Story of Cain," C. Pyatt Festschrift, To Do and To Teach, (Lexington, Ky., 1953), pp. 53-64.

preceded vs. 2 because the pattern in vs. 1 is ruptured in vs. 2 both with respect to form and style.[13] There is no quotation from the mother relating the significance of the child's name, instead one finds a simple statement of occupation (lacking any word-play). The birth notices in vs. 17-22 are as curt and also lack the familiar verbal play.

The text of vs. 7 is a parade example of the corrupted text. The many variant readings in LXX, the Peshitta, Targum Onkelos, Vulgate, Samaritan differ from the MT in an effort to make sense of the grammar. This writer chooses to read it thus:

7a "If you do well, you will be happy.

If not, sin is the demon that awaits you at the door.

7b It desires you, yet you can master it."

The advantages of this reading lie in this:

1) 7ad states plainly the wisdom character of the narrative and perhaps holds the key to the tragedy of Cain.

2) 7ab רבץ is read with Speiser as "demon" in keeping with the serpent figure of ch. 3 and is a literary and theological ploy of J; that evil is external to man but needs man's active cooperation to become effective is already established in ch. 3.

3) 7b the rendering of תמשל-בו is difficult. "You may/must/will master him" depends on the interpretation of the entire verse which may not

---

13 Perhaps a simpler form such as: "And Adam's wife Eve bore Cain who became a tiller of the ground; and she again bore his brother Abel who became a shepherd of the flocks".

have been its burden if 7b was a misplaced marginal gloss as P. Haupt has suggested.[14] If רבץ is made the object of agreement for 7b then the syntax is "faultless" as Speiser has demonstrated.

Commentators have long noted the relationship of the Cain-Abel story with that of Adam and Eve. Von Rad has called attention to the האדמה motif present in 2-3 and 4, that banishment follows the sin instead of death, and that hope is held out to the sinner. Of greater interest to this study, however, is the remarkable use of wisdom motifs by J.

As the story unfolds, each brother offers to Yahweh the produce of his living. For reasons unstated, Abel's is accepted and Cain's not. Cain becomes enraged and he is put on his guard by Yahweh as to the consequences of his rage. Yet Cain slays Abel and is banished. The predicament that Cain finds himself in after learning that his offering is unacceptable is similar to Job's problem: he has followed the rules and Yahweh has done something which Cain cannot understand. J deliberately keeps his audience in the dark as to why the offering was unacceptable so that one may experience the dismay of Cain. He does not respond as the pious Job: "the Lord gave, and the Lord has taken away; blessed be the name of the Lord". (Job 2:21). Instead his anger consumes him; he has played by the rules and not won. It is unclear if the offerings were made in the context of a contest as in 1 Kings 18:20-40; it does not seem to be a facet of the story, nor is the relative merit of a blood sacrifice as against a cereal offering argued.

---

[14] P. Haupt as cited in O. R. Sellers, op.cit., p. 61.

Thus vs. 7 assumes that Cain knows whether he has done well or not. While the knowledge spoken of is related to the action of the sacrfice (whose details are withheld from the reader), now Cain's response to Yahweh's action taken center stage. Cain is crestfallen (vs. 6) so the statement in the protasis of 7aa is a contininuing possibility[15] not with respect to the sacrifice but his response to Yahweh. If a man does well, then happiness should mark that man. On the other hand in 7ab the imperfect is followed by a noun clause with the Kal participle רבץ, a curious construction found again only in Job 8:6 and 31:26-28. The circumstances in Job 8:6 are that Bildad assures Job that "if you are pure and upright, surely then he will rouse himself for you and reward you with a rightful habitation". Bildad's authority is the proverbs of "bygone ages" (vs. 8) such as Pr. 3:33: "The Lord's curse is on the house of the wicked but he blesses the abode of the righteous"; the נוה צדיקים reappears in Pr. 24:15 in a sense similar to Gen. 4:7: "Lie not in wait as a wicked man against the dwelling of the righteous (לנוה צדיק) do not violence to his home (רבצו)".[16]

---

15 The imperfect תיטיב has this sense in the conditional clause but is reenforced by אם . Cf. E. Kautzsch, Gesenius' Hebrew Grammer (Oxford, 1963), 2nd ed. ed. by A. E. Cowley, pp. 494-495. The infinitive construct שאה in the apodasis is dependent on the sense in the protasis.

16 Again in Pr. 1:11, 18; 12:6 lying in wait for the blood of an innocent man is the tempter's (v. 10) phrase to lure the young man into folly. The father reveals in v. 18 the real consequence of those who lie in wait. Yahweh in Gen. 4:7 acts as the wise father counselling Cain to be wary lest he do something foolish in his passion. Also, Pr. 3:9-12, Jb. 5:17.

XUM

Again in Job. 31:26-28 the scene is the righteous man asserting his innocence and integrity. But Cain, an unwise young man, does not heed the warnings but slays his brother. The contrast is between the fool who hates knowledge (Pr. 1:22), would not heed counsel (1:29-33), who must now suffer the dread of evil, and the wise man secure in Yahweh.

Psalm 37 echoes the same concerns vs. 3: "trust in the Lord, and do good; so you will dwell in the land and enjoy security", vs. 8: "Refrain from anger, and forsake wrath! Fret not yourself; it tends only to evil. For the wicked shall be cut off; but those who wait for the Lord shall possess the land" (also, vss. 22, 28-29). Cain now becomes as "the wicked watches the righteous, and seeks to slay him (vs. 32)".[17] The psalmist supposes that the anger is that of the righteous men who watch the wicked prosper and by their anger place themselves in the immediate danger of evil. The object of Cain's wrath cannot be Abel for Abel has done him no injustice; it is Yahweh who has cheated him and his act of revenge (slaying Abel) is truly in defiance of Yahweh, the Lord of life.

It is in this wisdom setting that 7b appears the more related to 7a. Evil is always present but the wise man will always master it. Thus, the suggestion of Haupt that it really belongs with 3:16 must be put aside as attractive as it is. Vs. 4:7b is parallel to it in thought but 3:16 specifically regards the woman's relationship with man, whereas 4:7b regards

---

[17] It is commonly accepted that Psalm 37 is a wisdom psalm. Cf. A. Weiser, The Psalms, Old Testament Library, (Philadelphia, 1962), pp. 312-323; S. Mowinckel, The Psalms in Israel's Worship II, (Oxford, 1962) pp. 111-114; McKenzie, DB, p. 705.

man's relationship with evil. It may be suggested that the imagery of Psalms 9-10 provide backdrop for Gen. 4:7. Psalm 9 celebrates the feast of Yahweh's covenant, his judgment over all men; Psalm 10:9 in the figure of a lion lurking in the thicket, depicts the wicked man lying in ambush (vs. 8), crouching for his prey (vs. 10), and boasting that God does not see him (vs. 11). While in Gen. 4:7 the demon lurks in wait for Cain to leave his abode, it is Cain who becomes the beast of prey against his brother in vs. 8. Through Cain's foolish anger he has allowed the evildoer to enter him, and now he has become the instrument, the mock-demon, of evil. Through Eve the serpent-demon reached Adam; through Cain innocent blood will be shed. The great tragedy of Cain is that Yahweh is describing what is and will happen to Cain (7a) and still holds out the possibility for Cain to act righteously (7b) - if he wills.

It is necessary that Cain goes out into the field to slay his brother for murder must occur at some distance from his נוה צדיק outside of which he becomes prey to the demon lurking at his door (compare Pr. 3:33). The open field is not a place of classic privacy; the author does not paint Cain as shrewd, he is blunt and simple. Yahweh asks: "Where is your brother Abel?" as easily as 3:9 "Where are you?" Cain's brazen answer exceeds Adam's pretense that the guilt was all Eve's. Rather than use the occasion for a word-play on vs. 2, J uses השמר אהי אנבי . The supposed imagery here is that Cain asks: am I the shepherd of my brother, a shepherd? The text has Cain condemn himself, for by his murder he has

presumed to be his brother's keeper; in 2:15 שמר has the sense of "to celebrate nature" and in 3:24 "to protect". Cain has committed the contrary. If Cain has been so bold as to commit acts reserved for the author of life, his act stands in stark contrast to Yahweh in 28:15: "Behold, I am with you and will keep you wherever you go, and will bring you back to this land; for I will not leave you until I have done that which I have spoken to you". As Von Rad observes: "Responsibility before God is responsibility for the brother".[18] The truly righteous man in J's eyes is Abraham as Yahweh soliloquizes in 18:19: "No, I have chosen him that he may charge his children and his household after him, to keep the way of the Lord (ושמרו דרך יהוה) by doing righteousness and justice; so that the Lord may bring to Abraham what he has promised".[19] In keeping the way of the Lord one also keeps one's kin and friends so that social responsibility goes hand in hand with "calling upon the name of Yahweh".

The dialogue continues parallel to 3:13: "What have you done?" The poetic and dramatic announcement that Abel's blood cries out to Yahweh is

---

[18] Von Rad, Genesis, p. 102. A trait of urbanization is the growing indifference of one man for another, weakened bonds of kinship, increased predatoriness. Cf. above pp. 22-23.

[19] Gen. 18:17-19 has been considered Yahwistic but not the usual style of J by Noth and Von Rad. Gunkel has noted the similarity of Dt. 6:1-3 with v. 19; Speiser gives it to J with the remark that this is the philosophical side of J. Cf. R. A. F. MacKenzie, CBQ 17(1955), pp. 277-286.

the first sign that blood spilled will not go unavenged. Yahweh now curses Cain himself. In ch. 3 he cursed the serpent (v. 14) and the ground (v. 17) but he did not curse the couple. The ground Adam was to work would yield its produce only with sweat; now, Cain would be driven from the arable land which would no longer be his to work. The J writer must have had it in mind that his audience would reflect upon how bountiful Yahweh has been to allow them the land he had promised them through Abraham. The figure of Cain cannot be compared to that of the peasant dispossessed of his land through no fault of his own. Cain's new status of a fugitive and wanderer must be seen through the eyes of a people whose economic basis was agriculture. Cain's complaint that his punishment is too great is in keeping with his refusal to admit guilt in v. 9. It is plain that he views being driven off the land as equivalent to being driven from the presence of Yahweh.[20] The desert or wilderness is a heinous abode of the lawless and uncivilized, where nothing is sacred and no man safe. But Yahweh promises to protect Cain from further bloodshed by some mysterious sign. The story closes with Cain leaving Yahweh's presence and making his home in the curious statement: בארצ-נוד קדמת-עדן, the antithesis of נוה צדיק.

---

20 Cf. J. Skinner, Genesis, p. 109. There is a relationship between Yahweh and the land underlying Cain's banishment from it. Yahweh's presence is visible in the sustenance the land gives to those who till it and call upon his name. From this proximity to Yahweh, Cain is removed to become a נוד in the land of נוֹד.

2. COMMENT

The classic mode of interpreting the Cain-Abel narrative has been to see in their sacrifice and conflict the ageless strife between the pastoral and agricultural vocations. It would be difficult to discover a commentary (Delitzsch does refrain) that does not suggest the enmity between the settler and the nomad as the origin of the story.[21] It is not within the scope of the present study to discredit this hallowed view of the Cain-Abel narrative, yet its perspective is not beyond question.

The story of Cain and Abel in its present setting is the story of two brothers, Cain the elder, Abel the younger (vss. 1-2). Ishmael and Isaac (Gen. 16, 18:1-15 (J), 21:8-21 (E), and Esau and Jacob (25;21-26a, 27-34) are similar in that the elder brother falls from grace while the younger is favored by Yahweh. But there is a major difference regarding the younger brother, Abel.

The figure of Abel as a pious and righteous man does not emerge

---

[21] C. Westermann, Genesis, Biblischer Kommentar Altes Testament, 1966-1972 (Neukirchen, 1971), pp. 428-431 offers the relevant parallels from the History of Religion material. However, the key to the narrative does not lie in myth but the wisdom Hintergrund. Cf. Kramer and Hooke for mythological motifs: S. Kramer, "Sumerian Literature and the Bible," Analecta Biblica 12(1959), pp. 185-204. S. H. Hooke, "Cain and Abel," The Siege Perilous: Essays in Biblical Anthropology and Kindred Subjects, (London, 1956), pp. 66-73. Besides the commentaries one may wish to consult: O. Gruppe, "Kain," ZAW 39(1921), pp. 67-76; N. Rhodokanakis, "Genesis 2-4," ZAW 39 (1921), pp. 76-83. J. B. Bauer, "Kain and Abel," ThPQ 103(1955), pp. 126-133; H. Gunkel, "Kain and Abel," RGG II (1929), pp. 584-585.

XUM

in the Old Testament.[22] Abel dies in his youth, without progeny, long-life and without apparent reason. He is eliminated from the stock through which mankind was to be blessed. His end is inglorious in the open field by the hand of his brother, with none to mark his death save the voice of his blood from the ground. Abel is a fleeting, tragic figure as his name may have been intended to suggest: nothingness, vanity.

Cain is the protagonist in the narrative which builds an ugly picture of the elder brother in the first family. As first born, Cain has the land and the right to his father's blessing; but, having had all, he forfeits all through his foolishness. Many wisdom motifs run through the narrative the first of which must be the assumption that the elder should be the wiser (Ps. 37:25). A rare cultic notice in Pr. 3:9 echoes the stipulation from the Book of the Covenant (Ex. 23:19) to honor the Lord with the sacrifice of the first fruits of all produced; the consequence in v. 10 should be that barns and vats will be bursting with plenty. What Cain does, if he did

---

22 In the apocryphal Book of Jashar 1:12-23 Abel is a pious and righteous man. Notice the author's attempt to reconstruct Gen. 4:2 on the pattern of v.1.

1:12b a-b-c-d-(e)-f-f1

1:13a f2-g-h

'g' [YWH]
1:13b (a-b-c-d-e-f-f1)-f2-g-h

'g'1 ['g'2]

Also in Hebrews 11:4, Abel is a hero of faith, a martyr.

anything wrong, is not communicated by J.[23] It may be surmised that the original narrative carried the reasons but J has suppressed them in building his theme.[24] If it had a relation to a Canaanite fertility cult, tell-tale signs of it have been omitted by J; in Pr. 7:14 the cult prostitute announces: "I had to offer sacrifices, and today I have paid my vows", suggests that J (see also Tamar, Gen. 38) had ample material to draw on to exploit the fertility theme but did not.

In v. 5, Cain learns that his sacrifice was not accepted and ויחר לקין מאד ויפלו פניו. There are two elements here: 1) inexplicably Yahweh does not favor Cain's offering and 2) Cain is enraged. A frequent theme in Proverbs is that no one may understand the mind of

---

[23] The cultic sphere is given little space in the wisdom literature. It may be a further sign that a sage has reworked an ancient cult legend here for his own purposes. The sacrifice of the wicked man is said to be loathed by Yahweh (Pr. 15:8). The more familiar theme is: Do what is right and just: that is more pleasing to the Lord than sacrifice (Pr. 21:3). The motif is seen again in 1 Sam. 15:22-23, where Samuel reproves Saul for disobeying the precept of the ban. He practiced divination and thus will lose the kingship.

[24] From vs. 10-12 the ground's barrenness is linked to Cain's murder which suggests that an unacceptable fertility rite was connected with Cain's sacrifice. If Cain carried out a Canaanite fertility practice to ensure productivity, presumably ritual intercourse, then the sin of ch. 3 would have been repeated in ch. 4, and Yahweh's place as the Lord of life reaffirmed. Cf. McKenzie, DB, p. 791; also, "Literary Characteristics of Genesis 2-3," Theological Studies 15 (1954), pp. 570-571. Was the fruit Cain offered, "forbidden fruit"? so that now he had "knowledge of good and evil"? The textual evidence in ch. 4 to support this extension is too slender in the present writer's opinion, although the relation to the fertility motif in J and the wisdom motif of knowledge is appealing.

XUM

Yahweh, and although a man may think himself righteous Yahweh knows his inner thoughts:

> Pr. 16:2: "All of a man's conduct is pure in his own eyes,
> but it is Yahweh who weighs up motives."
>
> 16:9: "A man plans his way,
> but Yahweh orders his step."
>
> 21:2: "A man's whole conduct is right in his own eyes,
> but it is Yahweh who weighs up motives."[25]

It is Yahweh's standard that is the norm for what is acceptable and what is not. It is a foolish man that sets his own wisdom against that of Yahweh (Pr. 21:30). The use of Urim and Thummim to discern the will of Yahweh occurs in 1 Sam. 14:18-19 where Saul does not wait for the completion of the casting: contrast 14:41-42 the cases between Saul and the people, Saul and Jonathan, and 1 Sam. 23:9-12 wherein David has Abiathar learn what Saul has planned against him. Recall the sentiment in Pr. 16:33:

> "The lot is cast into the lap
> but the decision is wholly from the Lord."

reflects the minimal role of man and the utter trust required once the lot is cast. Cain's rebellion against Yahweh's decision is an act of classic folly. The antithesis of Cain is Joseph who through patience and hindsight can

---

25 Translation is from W. McKane, Proverbs, Old Testament Library, (Philadelphia, 1970), pp. 235-243.

XUM

perceive the will of Yahweh, Gen. 45:8 (J) and 50:20 (E).[26]

The Yahwist immediately moves to Cain's response of anger. Pr. 16:14, 32 relate heat and anger as unwise responses; cover the king's anger, before it consumes you, be slow to anger and you will be mightier than those who take a city. Again in 22:24 the sage advises:

> "Make no friendship with a man given to anger
> nor go with a wrathful man."

Amen-em-opet instructs that an angry man is like a tree growing in the open field destined for the fire, while the tranquil man like a tree in a garden yielding a bounty of fruit.[27] The way of life is to follow the road guided by wisdom, those who forsake it follow the path to death (Pr. 4:10-19).

---

26 Cf. G. Von Rad, "The Joseph Narrative and Ancient Wisdom," Hexateuch, pp. 296-297. So much of the discourse of Job's friend is built on the principle that man is a mere mortal not destined to know the mind of God; 11:6: "He would tell you what is hidden, for there are two sides to wisdom. God even forgets part of your guilt." Cain will not get as much as he deserves, Gen. 4:13. The correlative thought is that each man gets what he deserves and not what he thinks he deserves. Note Pr. 24:12:

> "Will you object, 'But look, we did not know'?
> Has he who weighs the heart no understanding,
> he who scans your soul no knowledge?
> He himself will repay a man as his deed deserves."

Also Job 34:11, and perhaps individual retribution is the intent of wisdom in Psalm 62:12, and Sirach 16:15.

27 ANET, p. 422. Again on p. 423, he counsels: "Do not associate to thyself the heated man, nor visit him for conversation". Qoheleth writes 7:9: "Do not be quick to show resentment; for resentment is nursed by fools". (NEB). Job 5:2 carries the same advice: "The fool is destroyed by his own angry passions, and the end of childish resentment is death". (NEB).

In this state he is confronted by Yahweh in v. 6. The crestfallen face may have many causes (Pr. 12:4 suggests a bad wife) but its effects are known: 14:30: jealousy makes the bones rot, 17:22: the downcast spirit dries up the bones, 15:33: low morale reflects a broken spirit. All of these are contrasted with the cheerful, tranquil man whose face reflects his purity of heart. Men with twisted-minds, filled with wrong-headedness are loathed by Yahweh 11:20; 15:26; 17:15; 3:32. On the other hand v. 7a holds the prospect:

> "Happy is the man who listens to me
> watching daily at my gates
> waiting beside my doors." Pr. 8:34.

But Cain is not such a man, he does not understand that:

> "The Lord reproves him whom he loves
> as a father the son in whom he delights." Pr. 3:12.

This is the way he dealt with David's sin (II Sam. 7:14-15) and would surely do so now.

Cain continues his willful path in v. 8 as he murders his brother (Cf. Pr. 2: 13). It would not be too subtle to suggest that the basis of social morality is at stake when one brother may slay another with impunity. The "fruit" of the murderer is violence and lawlessness (Pr. 11:30), he must be removed from society by separation from the land of the just (Pr. 10:30), whoever "flouts the social morality of whom Yahweh is the guarantor will not regain the paths of life".[28]

The expected fate of foolish Cain is related in vss. 11-16 wherein his

---

28 McKane, Proverbs, p. 288.

curse is: to be removed from civilized society, to be unsettled, wandering in a land without law, without Yahweh.

> "for the upright will dwell in the land
> and men of integrity will be left in it;
> but the wicked will be cut off from the land,
> and the treacherous will be uprooted from it." Pr. 2:20-22.

This is the life of the fugitive, not the occupation of the nomad. In fact the chapter has little to say about nomadism, unless to view it as a curse.[29]

The contrast between Cain and Abel as one between the peasant and the nomad is a modern construct. The narrative itself looks favorably upon the original state of Cain, what it abhors is the lawless, unsettled wandering of men who, through their folly, contribute nothing to civilized society. Cain is the figure of the elder brother in whom one would expect wisdom but does not. He is blessed with the God-given fruit of the land upon which there is a precept that the first fruits must be sacrificed to Yahweh. If Cain's error was in what or how he sacrificed, J has suppressed it, instead he goes to the psychology of the unwise by dwelling on Cain's response to Yahweh's decision. He is cursed and banished from the land, but Yahweh signs him so that he will not suffer a similar fate at the hands of other men. The sign must be related to Cain's belief in Yahweh for it is Yahweh's presence that

---

[29] The confusion of Jabal representing the father of nomadism (4:20) while Abel already has, and Cain is condemned to, does not hinder Wolf's description of the nomadic ideal. Cf. C. U. Wolf, "Nomadism," IDB III, pp. 558-560.

he must leave as he enters the land of Nod (Ex. 33:12-16).[30] The same vagueness characterizes the conclusion of ch. 3; Adam and Eve are clothed by Yahweh, expelled from the garden, but to where? The schema just recalled in 4:2-16 is basically that of 2-3.[31] In this manner of viewing the figure of Cain from a wisdom perspective, his relation to v. 17's Cain will come into sharper focus.

The Cainite genealogy comprises the third part of chapter four. If one consigns vs. 17a, 25 and 26 as belonging to the redactor, the remaining verses may be grouped in this manner: 18-22, the genealogy; 23-24, song

---

30 The literature attempting an interpretation of what the sign of Cain might be is extensive, the reader is referred only to B. Stade, "Beiträge zur Pentateuchkritik: I Das Kainszeichen," ZAW 14(1894), pp. 250-318; אות is a tribal mark, according to Stade, specifically the Kenites, which protects Cain from blood-vengence. Cf. also, O. Sauermann, "Bermerkungen zum Kainzeichen, Genesis 4:15b," Antonianum 33 (1958), pp. 45-56; R. Eisler, "Das Qainzeichen und die Qeniter," Le Monde Oriental 23(1929), pp. 48-56; A. Zeydner, ZAW 18 (1898), pp. 120-125; Westermann, BKATN, 1, pp. 424-428. Driver's comment seems sobering even today: "what it was is not stated, and it is idle to speculate". Genesis, p. 67.

31 Cf. L. Alonso-Schökel, "Motivos sapienciales y de alianza en Gen. 2-3," Biblica 43(1962), pp. 295-315. A digest of the article appeared in English in, "Sapiential and Covenant Themes in Genesis 2-3," TD 13 (1965), p. 3-10. W. Brueggemann's attempt to relate the Cain-Abel narrative to Amnon-Absalom (2 Sam. 13-14) must be regarded as strained. 2 Sam. 14:6 may call Gen. 4:8 to mind but Absalom slays Amnon because his brother has committed incest, a violation of Torah, Cain has no basis for righteous indignation. Yet this weak portion of his analogy does not detract from Brueggemann's main thesis that the J primeval history is dependent on the David Story. Cf. W. Brueggemann, "David and his Theologian," CBQ 30(1968), pp. 156-181. Also, J. Blenkinsopp, SVT, 15(1965), pp. 44-57.

of Lamech; 17b, the transitional or swing verse from 17a pattern to the second genealogical pattern in 18-22. However one must speak iuxta modum of a literary pattern in 18-22.

Father (A) begets (B) child (C) occurs four times in v. 18 and 10:8 but not elsewhere. Husband (K) takes (e) a wife (m) occurs in v. 19 and 25:1; wife (m) bears (b) children (n) is found in vss. 20, 22; 22:21, 24; 24:2 only; the father (A) begets (b) children (n) in 10:13, 15, 21, 25, 26. There exists a loosely fitting similarity but no strict form in these geneaolgies.

Apparently there are seven generations in the Cainite genealogy, two in the Sethite in J, while P retains ten. Some difficulty in attaching the Noah fragment from 5:29 remains. In form it belongs to 4:1, 17a, 25-26 which would provide a list like this: Adam had two sons, Cain (v. 1) and Seth (v. 26); Cain had a son Enoch (v. 17a) and Seth had one Enosh (v. 26). The addition of Noah interrupts the symmetry but if it must be placed thematically it would do well as an antithesis to Cain's curse as much as Seth is said to have replaced Abel. Thus the father of Noah in J is lost and conjecture cannot restore him with any certainty. The alternative, if one discounts the form, that Noah's father was Lamech, must face the awkward insertion of 5:29 after 4:22 or 24; that Lamech, was his father could have been the construct of P alone. The suggestion has been made that 4:25-26 preceded 4:1 or 17 and were transposed by a redactor.[32]

---

32 Cf. Skinner, Genesis, p. 99 rejects Stade's view.

It must be concluded that two ancient geneaolgies have been placed together by the redactor; it is not known from which the Noah fragment has been detached by P. Noah is the tenth generation after Adam in P; if this generation had special significance for P there is some reason to wonder why he removed it from ch. 4 unless it did not stand tenth and its meaning would have either been lost or conflicted with his. If Noah was the tenth generation in ch. 4 (no matter how one arranges the other nine) and contained special significance for J, it has been lost. Mendenhall's thesis that the tenth generation, which occurs historically about every 250-300 years, witnesses and takes part in the destruction of the old civilization, would describe Noah's position in the genealogy if the redactor (J) were presaging the Flood.[33] The core Cainite genealogy seems unaware of any impending disaster as it describes the growth of the material arts in 17-22.

The original narrative would seem to be 18-24. If Cain is regarded as the eponymous ancestor of the Kenites then 17a may be later than 18-24 because there would have been a need to place a head on the body of the genealogy. P had either a different viewpoint of the same list or a different tradition to work from in ch. 5. Thus, the relation of Cain to the figures in the list must be regarded as secondary. Likewise the song of Lamech, 23-24, has been used to expand the figure of Lamech who already had the lion's share in the genealogy.

---

[33] Mendenhall, Generation, pp. 217-226.

Older critics attempted to discern a Babylonian origin for the names of Irad, Mehujael, Methushael, Lamech, Adah and Zilpah.[34] The arbitrary character of the results has been reviewed by Hauret and termed either optimistic or pessimistic according to the manner of interpreting the entire genealogy.[35] For example מהויאל (מהי[ר]אל) is rendered "destructeur de Dieu" by Hauret while Budde and Skinner relate it to 5:13 of the LXX: Μαλελεήλ (מהללאל) or "God makes me live". מתושאל is variously given: "l'homme cupide", "l'homme du shéol" (Hauret) and "liegeman of God" "a king who taught men good laws and restrained wild animals and wild men." (Cheyne). Of more promise has been Hallo's attempt to relate the figures to antediluvian sages "linked with Eridu as early as Old Babylonian times".[36]

The antediluvian apkallu were paired with the first three or four of the cities in the King List while all seven of the postdiluvian sages were explicitly joined "to cities of their own in the various cuneiform traditions".[37] He asserts that "biblical recasting of the traditions is quite in keeping with the genealogical orientation that makes its appearance in the Ancient

---

[34] T. K. Cheyne, "Cainites," EB vol. 1, cols. 625-626.

[35] C. Hauret, "Réflexions Pessimistes et Optimistes sur Gen. IV, 17-24," BEJhL XII(1959), pp. 358-365. Also, J. Gabriel, "Die Kaintengenealogie Gen. 4:17-24," Biblica 40(1959), pp. 409-427.

[36] Hallo, JCS, 23(1971), p. 62.

[37] Ibid.

XUM

Near East with the coming of the Amorites".[38] What is preserved in the apkallu tradition is the emergence of cities as the achievement of culture-heroes. Zimmern has traced the correspondence of names in Berossos list and Genesis to the conclusion that the biblical authors were dependent on the Babylonian sources.[39] Genesis 4 reflects a popular tradition while ch. 5 is a dry stylized account, except for Enoch in 5:22. In Berossos, Enoch (or Oannes in the Greek text) was described as the source of human wisdom, especially, astrology. Hallo remarks that "Oannes is the Graecized form of Sumerian U4-an which in late texts tended to be (playfully) equated with the Akkadian ummânu, "sage, teacher" while HNWK is derived from the root meaning "to train, educate".[40] He concludes that Enoch suggests the figure of the sage, vizier rather than a specific city. The Enoch of 4:17 builds the first city (following Cassuto) and names it after his son Irad which, Hallo continues, should be identified as the anti-diluvian city Eridu, so pronounced in Old Babylonian times.[41] Lamech may phonetically be related to Larak; as Noah's father, he is similar to

---

[38] Ibid.

[39] H. Zimmern, The Babylonian and Hebrew Genesis (London, 1901), pp. 45-46. Contra Zimmern, cf. E. Reiner, Orientalia 30(1961), p. 6. Reiner sees the apkallu as separate from the kings and notes that a similar practice may be found in Egypt wherein the vizier is the chief royal official. Recall the discussion of the Seven Sages on pp. 52-53, esp. n. 28.

[40] Hallo, op. cit. p. 64. Cf. also, G. Smith, The Chaldean Account of Genesis, (New York, 1880), pp. 33-40, 104-106.

[41] Hallo, ibid.

Shuruppak father of Ziusudra;[42] as father of Tubal-Cain, he recalls Bad-tibera, the fortress of metal workers, or Sippar, the city of bronze. Hallo feels that the tradition of antediluvian cities and their sages has been recast in Genesis as individual descendents of the man who built the first city, devoid of mythological embroidery.

It has long been granted that the names are of eastern origin that may have come into Canaan with a group migrating during the second millenium and settling in southern Judah. Hallo's approach places considerable stress on the more common view of seeing in the names a tribal genealogy.[43]

Seen in isolation, the intent of the original genealogy remains problematical. However, the manner in which the narrator has drawn it into the primeval history is less opaque. Thus if one infers with Hallo that the Babylonian material which served as the model was an ancient list of antediluvian cities with their sages, the mention of city-building in v. 17 and the flowering of the skills of animal husbandry, music and metal working have a cohesiveness. It may be proposed then that the J narrator has recast the Babylonian material and placed it conjunctive to vs. 2-16 for a specific purpose.

In view of the work of the redactor, the Cain of v. 17 cannot be regarded

---

42 On the relation of Ziusudra to Noah see E. G. Kraeling, "The Interpretation of the Name "Noah" in Gen. 5:29," JBL 48(1929), pp. 138-143; J. Morgenstern, "A Note on Genesis 5:29," JBL 49(1930), pp. 306-309.

43 M. D. Johnson, The Purpose of the Biblical Genealogies (Cambridge, 1969), pp. 7-14.

as unrelated to the Cain of 1-16; further, Gunkel's reasoning that no intelligent writer would put city-building (17b) before cattle-rearing (20) and therefore 17b is a late addition, confines the ancient author to nineteenth century A.D. concepts of cultural evolution. The stumbling block in v. 17 for Skinner is not that a murderer built the first city, but a nomad.[44]

A walled town was a city; an unwalled one, a village. The earliest and most frequent sense of the word עיר is that of a fortified town. That Cain or his son constructed an enclosure for self-protection would not be such an illogical step to the narrator. Nor would it seem far from his intent that infamy should be associated with the founding of cities, if cities were the products of men's folly as the climatic story of Gen. 11:1-9 in J's primeval history portends. Cities are a by-product of the irascible Cain whose roots in the land are cut off by the curse but whose wandering in Nod is not endless. The city is the creation of man, not Yahweh; it began as a compromise for the landless Cain and his progeny, all tainted with his legacy.

The author rapidly continues with Cain's descendants whose connotations must be apparent to J's contemporaries. With Lamech's children certain arts of civilization are introduced. Jabal, the progenitor of tent-dwellers who tend cattle, Jubal, the father of all who play the lyre and pipe, Tubal-Cain, the metal worker, and his sister Naamah. Compared with the

---

[44] It must be admitted that either a murderer or a nomad is a poor risk as a community builder. However, Cain is a fugitive rather than a nomad, whose crime was murder, the most violent anti-community act a man may commit against his neighbor.

account in Sirach 38:24-34 and the Egyptian "Satire on the Trades"[45] the J list is brief and noncommital. Particularly glaring is the lacuna of the scribal profession from the list of urban arts. Two reasons may account for this: 1) the list was never intended to be comprehensive, or 2) the scribe did not wish to be found among them for social and political reasons.[46]

Necessary for urban life according to Sirach are: the scribe, a man of leisure unencumbered with manual tasks, the farmer-herdsman (38:25-26), the designer (27), the smith (28), the potter (29-30). The tradesmen are the brawn but not the brains of the city (31-34); they are lowly but possess dignity. The caustic review of the trades by the Egyptian scribe carries scant sympathy for the sculptor, the metal worker (whose skin was shrivelled and odor foul), the jeweler, the barber, the river merchant, the building contractor (dirtier than a pig), the builder of walls, the gardener, the tenant-farmer, the weaver, the arrow-maker, and fisherman. But of the scribe: "As for the scribe, every place of his is at the Residence City, and he will not be poor in it. (But) if he uses the wisdom of someone else, he will not come out successfully".[47]

---

[45] ANET, pp. 432-434.

[46] M. Johnson remarks that "the underlying aim of these genealogies is at once political and apologetic. Also, their literary function in the context of J seems to consist in supplementing and tying together the narrative elements". op. cit. p. 7. Thus a third motive for the scribal absence may be that a polemic was intended as suggested below pp. 160-161.

[47] ANET, p. 432.

Jabal is the father of herdsmen who dwell in tents. Soldiers and merchants also dwelt in tents for extended periods of time and could easily be considered tent-dwellers. Here though, the addition of ומקנה seems to qualify who it is that "dwell in tents". The author bypasses the opportunity in v. 20 to make a play on רעה עאן of v. 2; in this the redactor may have been limited by the traditional form he received, yet as Cassuto remarks, there may be grounds to suppose the author wishes attention to be drawn to מקנה. The sounds of מקנה (20), כנור (21 קינה), תובל-קין (22) may allude to the name of their ancestor קין and be a literary device bonding the parts to the head. If one recalls that these children of Lamech are descendents of the first city builder then their respective occupations should be seen in relation to the city. Skinner's belief that nomadic shepherds are indicated here may be viewed with reserve. It might be more consistent with v. 17 to consider them as seasonal trans-humanists in the manner Luke has described at Mari.[49] These herdsmen are a portion of a village-based society, usually the younger in age (as Abel was), that graze livestock within prescribed limits. As such the Jabal-group would have an integral part in urban economy, if not life.

The god Dumuzi was the fifth king in the Babylonian antediluvian king list, a shepherd king. This god reappears in the Sumerian poem, "Dispute

---

[48] U. Cassuto, A Commentary on the Book of Genesit I, (Jerusalem, 1961) trans. fr. Hebrew by Israel Abrahams, p. 235.

[49] J. T. Luke, Pastoralism and Politics, p. 277.

between the Shepherd-God and the Farmer-God: Dumuzi and Enkimdu". The goddess Inanna rejects the querulous Dumuzi in favor of the farmer Enkimdu, a reversal of roles in the Cain-Abel story, (ANET, pp. 41-42). Shepherds do not fare well in Gen. 46:31-34 wherein Joseph proposes to describe his brothers as "keepers of cattle" rather than shepherds. Perhaps the Egyptian hatred of shepherds is related to the Hyksos rule. Jacob informs Laban that the life of a shepherd is hazardous and may be injurious to health and comfort (Gen. 31:38-40). Moses must rescue Reuel's daughters from shepherds in Ex. 2:16-19. David is a shepherd in his youth but goes on to better things with maturity. The title came to be applied to a variety of people in authority: kings, royal officers, elders, even judges (II Sam. 7:7). In the later literature of Isaiah, Jeremiah and Ezekiel (Ez. 34:1-31), they are upbraided for failure in responsibility. It is evident that Judah's rulers are intended in Jer. 23:1-4, so that shepherding was frequently associated with authority and responsbility. It may be suggested then that the figure of Jabal intimating someone in or possessing authority would not be lost on the Yahwist's audience.

Jubal as the father of musicians may have a counterpart in the younger child of Zillah, Naamah.[50] The עוגב was probably the double reed pipe

---

[50] Note the flamboyant conjectures of P. Flugge, "Lamechs Tochter Naema," ZAW 62(1950), p. 314, that Naamah signifies a repudiation of woman's lot as given in 3:16: "Ich aber will nicht verlangen nach dem, der Herr über mich sein soll. Ich will frei sein." She will not bear children in pain because she will not desire either children or man. "Ich bin mir selbst genug." Cf. also, H. L. Ginsberg, "Women singers and wailers among the northern Canaanites," BASOR 72(1938), pp. 13-15.

blown obliquely and formed a better complement to the כנור than the older שופר did. The word occurs again only in Job 21:12; 30:31 and Psalm 150:4 and always in conjunction with the כנור. On the other hand the כנור is a very popular instrument at home in the liturgy and on non-cultic occasions (Gen. 31:27). In I Sam. 10:5 a band of prophets outside Gibeath-elohim encounter the newly annointed Saul and as they play the instrument, he joined them and prophesied. Apparently it became an occasion of reproach for Saul as v. 12 reports: "Therefore it became a proverb, 'Is Saul also among the prophets?'" Yet in I Sam. 16:16-23 the young David is called in to soothe the troubled spirit of Saul; its usage in these early passages is related to acts of divination outside the cult. Later, in I Chron. 13:8 David instructs the Levites to play it in the services (15:16, 21, 28; 16:5) and to prophesy with its music (25:1, 3, 6). For Solomon it had no mysterious power but was simply an instrument one might enhance materially by building it with precious almug wood from Ophir. Throughout the Psalms it is an instrument of praise save once in Ps. 49:4, a wisdom psalm. The poetic sage struggles with the problem (found in Ps. 37 as well): how does man transcend the limitations of his lot in life? He answers v. 20: "Man in his pomp is without understanding he is like the beasts that are killed".[51] The use of the כנור to aid the mind in solving this riddle of life is presented as if the sage were a prophet and about to declare a revelation.

The past emphasis upon the itinerant life style of some musicians has

---

[51] Weiser, Psalms, p. 385.

overlooked the other settings the texts suggest. The temple and cult needed a dependable group of musicians; Chronicles knows it for a fact and presumes that David appointed the Levites to be responsible. They had no land but they were not wandering, shiftless, or nomadic. The other group, the נביאים seem to have lived outside of cities and towns, to have made a living by prophesying while in a frenetic state.[52] They do not seem to be pictured as rapacious hordes wandering the desert, although the quality of their profession was not beyond suspicion. In Jubal, then, complex associations of music, prophecy, and wisdom are conjured up by J in the simple statement that a descendent of Cain through Lamech fathered the enigmatic נביאים and similar groups,[53] who, while landless were nevertheless part of the urban system.

Most probably it is Tubal-Cain rather than Cain that one should assume is the eponymous ancestor of metal workers. Mendenhall is convinced that the name is Anatolian in origin.[54] Cheyne has seen a Babylonian correlate

---

[52] McKenzie, DB, pp. 694-696. DeVaux, Ancient Israel, pp. 384-386.

[53] North's opinion based on Albright that these musicians were "bohemian Kenites" quite similar to the modern Sleibs found by Doughty in the Arabian desert during the late 1800's is arresting but highly tentative in view of the slim textual evidence produced and the precarious nature of applying modern tribal models to ancient ones. Cf. R. North, "The Cain Music," JBL 83 (1964), p. 381. The most recent and incisive study of ancient and modern nomadism is the study of M. Rowton, "Enclosed Nomadism," JESHO, 17 (1974), pp. 1-30.

[54] Mendenhall, Generation, p. 89, n. 57, also p. 171.

in Gibil or Nusku the solar-fire deity:[55] in his mythical realm Tubal was an "instructor of men in the art of getting fire". Eerdmans seems further afield in suggesting a correspondence between "Yahweh, God of Fire" as the Kenite deity itself a later transposition of some ancient solar god.[56] Skinner, following Frazer, would regard the smithy as a form of the black arts and therefore to be held in contempt by Semitic nomads.[57] Nor is Flugge's fantasy that in Tubal-Cain one finds the defiant attitude of one who can create a product greater in strength and use than anything Yahweh has made any closer to the truth.

The carefully reasoned hypothesis of Rowley that Moses came to know Yahweh through his Kenite relatives, and that these Yahweh worshippers had Cain as their eponymous ancestor, must be briefly examined here.[58] It is

---

[55] Cheyne, EB, I, col. 627. ANET, p. 72 (wherein he maintains the sharp weapons), 391 (with Irra, cf. above pp. 52-54), 458-459 (active in the destruction of Ur). The LXX renders Tubal, the hammerer as, χαλκεύς the Iliad's expression for Hephaestos, the Greek form of Gibil.

[56] B. D. Eerdmans, Religion of Israel, pp. 14-15, 18-19.

[57] G. Frazer, Folklore in the Old Testament abridged ed. (New York, 1927), p. 214.

[58] H. H. Rowley, "Moses and Monotheism," From Moses to Qumran, (New York, 1963), pp. 35-63. In addition to the bibliography cited by Rowley one may note C. A. Keller, "Keniter," RGG III (1959), col 1243. B. Mazar, "The Sanctuary of Arad and the Family of Hobab the Kenite INES 24(1965), pp. 297-303. F. C. Fensham, "Did a Treaty Between the Israelites and the Kenites Exist?" BASOR 175(1964), pp. 51-54. W. F. Albright, "Jethro, Hobab and Reuel in Early Hebrew Tradition," CBQ 25(1963), pp. 4-9. Contra Rowley see C. H. W. Brekelmans, "Exodus XVIII and the Origins of Yahwism," OTS 10(1954), pp. 215-224.

XUM

in Jdg. 4:11 that Heber the Kenite is said to have separated signifying the Kenites as a group. Their traditional territorial home in southern Judah, perhaps south east of Hebron, coincides with that of the Calebites with whom they are associated in I Chron. 2:55. Rowley argues that Moses transformed the Yahwism he received with a fresh quality of faith, imbued it with his prophetic personality, and called for a new ethical basis contained in the Decalogue. It has been suggested that the artisans of the Beni Hasan relief represent itinerant Kenites trading with Egyptians. The Kenites are associated with the larger social organization, the Midianites, whose seasonal transhumance carried them through the Negeb and the Sinai.

If the purpose of the Cain narrative is to place his descendants in an undesirable light, then little is solved. In only two texts do they appear so: 1) the oracles of Balaam, Nbs. 24:21-22: Noth regards the verses as late additions possibly middle eighth or ninth century B.C.;[59] 2) their near destruction at the hands of Saul because he found them among the Amalekites (I Sam. 15:6-7); yet they are spared because: "you showed kindness to all the people of Israel when they came up out of Egypt". The Kenites had settled near Arad (Jdg. 1:16) bordering Amalekite territory; now Saul orders them to leave. If the Cain-narrative is still to be related to the Kenites it must be allowed that it is not a Kenite tradition.

---

59 M. Noth, Numbers, Old Testament Library (London, 1966), p. 193.

If one is permitted to speak of Tubal-Cain as a metal worker without entanglement in the Kenite question two sources may be tapped for aid. Excavations by Rothenberg in the Negeb have emended Glueck's theory that Ezion-geber was Solomon's "Pittsburgh".[60] As far north as Tell Deir 'Alla near Jabbak's entrance on the plain, a center of metallurgy has been unearthed. Franken relates that Solomon probably had the bronze and copper for his temple cast here because: "he found people acquainted with metalwork, building and heating of furnaces and probably the right substance of clay to form moulds".[61] Solomon secures a Hiram (or Huram-abi of II Chron. 2:12-13) of Tyre to do the bronze casting. "...he was full of wisdom, understanding and knowledge for making any work in bronze (I Kgs. 7:14)".[62] One also learns in 1 Sam. 13:19-22 that the Israelites had no smith to work iron because the Philistines had the monopoly and the secret. A similar concern is voiced in Jos. 17:16, 18: "all the Canaanites who dwell in the plain have chariots of iron".[63] Again in Jdgs. 1:19: "...but he could not drive out the inhabitants of the plain, because they had chariots of iron". The

---

[60] B. Rothenberg, "Ancient Copper Industries in the Western Arabah," PEQ 94(1962), pp. 7-71. Cf. R. North, "Metallurgy in the Ancient Near East," Orientalia 24(1955), pp. 78-88.

[61] H. J. Franken, "The Excavations at Deir 'Alla in Jordan," VT 10(1960), pp. 386-393, esp. p. 389.

[62] Cf. J. Gray, I and II Kings, Old Testament Library (Philadelphia, 1963), pp. 171-186. He gives this portion of Kings to the temple archives; Noth does also, with the understanding that it was the Deuteronomic historian who utilized the source.

[63] Eissfeldt has assigned Jos. 17:16-18 to J and likewise Jdgs. 1:19.

magnitude of the Canaanite chariotry is given in Jdgs. 4:3 and 13; Sisera had 900 chariots of iron.

The excavations at Tell Deir 'Alla reveal that the furnaces were built outside the city walls, near to the thick clay needed for molds, and situated to catch the northern breeze. Foundry work is heavy industry and by Solomon's day it was big business. Light industry would continue as peddlers of small metal objects would travel in small groups throughout the land. Smiths could be quite settled or not. The Kenites at times seem to be sedentary, they are said to have cities in Jos. 15:57, Jdgs. 1:16, I Sam. 30:29; again they appear at various places as in the north, Jdgs. 4:11, 17. The smith was another landless yet relatively stable segment within the tenth century society dependent on the urban system.

The Israelites stand in mixed wonder at the material skills of their non-Israelite neighbors. How is it that such men could mine silver, refine gold, dig iron, smelt copper in the dark bowels of the earth, open shafts in valleys far from men, and fashion all manner of technology without fear of the Lord. Compared to wisdom, human technology is folly. This is the sentiment of the hymn to Wisdom in Job 28. The wisdom of Hiram or a Bezalel (Ex. 31: 2-3, P) is the amazing natural skill of an artisan not the fruit of the man of reflection.

Most commentators view the song of Lamech as an independent snatch of song, of nomadic milieu, attached to the figure of Lamech to depict the depravity men had reached prior to the Flood. It speaks of unlimited and disproportionate blood revenge. It would seem that the song is a literary

device employed to pull the reader back to 4:15 to realize the moral distance man has plummeted down the path of folly. Mendenhall has demonstrated that vengence was regarded as the sole perogative of Yahweh under the covenant.[64] Blood-revenge, no matter how hallowed a tribal custom, could not be countenanced in a civilized society. As Mendenhall observes: "A [redacted]y sufficiently developed to have produced these written documents certainly would also have transcended the blood feud as a socially acceptable means of obtaining redress".[65] Yet the recital of revenge in the Succession History during the time of the narrator must have appalled his ethical sensitivity.

Perhaps the greatest among Saul's sins against Yahweh was his vengeful massacre of the priests at Nob (I Sam. 22:6-23). Ironically Saul accuses David of lying in wait (ארב) for him;[66] Ahimelech, the father of David's future priest Abiathar, responds to Saul's charges in a guileless manner. Only Doeg, an Edomite, will carry out Saul's command to slaughter the house of Ahimelech. After disposing of the sacrilegious murders Doeg put the entire town to the sword as if acting under the ban. Saul would not do as much against the Amalekites (I Sam. 15:7-9) when Samuel had expressly relayed that Yahweh desired their death under the ban; now he has accomplished it not against the heathen but his own priests. The atrocity

---

[64] Mendenhall, Generation, pp. 69-104.

[65] Ibid., p. 74.

[66] Recall the context of Pr. 1:11, 18; 7:12; 12:6 discussed on p. 130, n. 16.

was not the work of blood lusting nomads but of the first anointed king of Israel, a fact surely not lost on the J narrator.

Assiduously as David attempts not to incur the guilt of blood-letting (II Sam. 1:15; 4:12; 21:1-9; 14:4-11) he is cursed as a "man of blood" by Shimei (II Sam. 16:7), and orders the execution of his foes on his death bed (1 Kgs. 2:5-9). But his close ally Joab slays Abner (II Sam. 3:22), David's nephew Amasa (II Sam. 20:10), and David's son Absalom (II Sam. 18:4) for which Solomon is given pretext to slay Joab (I Kgs. 2:28-33). Absalom murders his brother Amnon for ravaging his sister Tamar (II Sam. 13:28); Solomon finds pretense for killing his older brother Adonijah (1 Kgs. 2:19-25); and David himself hands seven sons of Saul to the Gibeonites to wipe clean the blood guilt from the house of Saul (II Sam. 21:1-9). There was ample evidence before the narrator that blood revenge was not relegated to the red-eyed nomads haunting the uncivilized desert. The Song of Lamech may have had a desert origin but the narrator has placed it in the context of the urban descendants of Cain; the most "civilized" are as capable of blood lust as Lamech.

A story of particular interest here is the narrative of the wise woman of Tekoa (II Sam. 13:38-14:33). One is struck by the affinities II Sam. 14:6 has with Gen. 4:8, and the desire of David to intervene in the blood feud to save the remaining brother from extinction and thus the name of the family. But what may be of greater moment is the woman's ability to tell the story at one level and draw David into commiting himself, and then reveal to him the inner purpose which concerns his family as well. The double entendre wherein she appears to be speaking about her own case but in reality is

speaking of the king's is also employed dramatically by Nathan in II Sam. 12:1-15.

Granted the sapiential character of the present form of Gen. 4:2-16 one may proceed to draw some conclusions regarding the present form of 4:17-24. The Yahwist has recast the ancient Babylonian list containing antediluvian cities, kings and apkallu to give it the appearance of a genealogy of a known but enigmatic social group within Israelite society, to wit, the Kenites. In deceptively simple strokes he has filled in the time between Adam and the Flood; in more subtle reshaping of popular traditions he has provided: 1) the story of the foolish and angry man, Cain and his curse: 2-16; and 2) the continued growth of folly in apparently wise men: 17-24.

The depth of the Yahwist is concealed in understatement, feigning naivete but having a thrust that cannot be avoided. The wisdom style of the woman of Tekoa or Nathan is artful but forceful. This was the manner in which one might address a David; but what of a Solomon?

The J author has wrought a radical reformulation of an old tradition with reference to a new situation. The cultural and religious pluralism of the monarchy had weakened appeals to Mosaic traditions to correct current abuses. Solomon's wealth and power, mirrored in his extravagant projects, stables at Megiddo, international commerce, temple at Jerusalem, and a harem of foreign beauties, brought new sophistication to every sphere of Israelite thought. As Brueggemann notes:

> In that situation it would have caused little impact to recite the Commandments, to scold and threaten, to

> quote tradition, because the enthusiasts for the new mood felt themselves emancipated from all the old sanctions which hardly seemed to operate anymore. It did no good to talk about the great redemptive intrusions of God in the past, because God didn't seem to come that way anymore. Besides, who needed him in the Solomonic situation? It did no good to talk about judgments and commandments because men in this mood are laws to themselves. No doubt some still tried the orthodox approach and no doubt they were deeply disappointed, for in such times conventional religious reminders and reassertions do not get a hearing.[67]

In this context the J writer has Cain, the fugitive of v. 16, beget a son Enoch who becomes the founder of urban life. It is appropriate than an apkallu initiate civilization as known in the city for this is how the Babylonian texts begin.[68] Enoch names the city after his son Irad.[69] The great city of Uruk was built by the Seven Sages (ANET, p. 73) or as Albright has phrased it: "the seven wise men of Enoch in the Gilgames Epic".[70] If the biblical Enoch bears a relation to the Babylonian tradition one realizes that J has had to modify who his father was, if he had one originally. The incon-

---

[67] W. Bruggemann, In Man We Trust, (Richmond, 1972), p. 50.

[68] Hallo is pressing the biblical texts too much when he suggests that Gen. 4:2-16 records the "agricultural revolution," and 17-24 the "urban revolution". op. cit., p. 64.

[69] Linguistically, Mazar has attempted to relate Irad with Arad, עירד with ערד and thus with the Kenites. The naming of children is a common parental prerogative; the naming of cities after persons is unusual, and may suggest that such as עיר would have been Enoch's son. Cf. B. Mazar, JNES 24(1965), p. 299, n. 16.

[70] W. F. Albright, "The Babylonian Antediluvian Kings," JAOS 43(1923), p. 327.

gruity of a wise man as the son of a fugitive is not so shocking if one reads Gen. 11:2, possibly another "first city" tradition recast to harmonize with 4:17.

The descendents of Enoch pass without comment until the final generation, the sons of Lamech. Past commentaries have tended to read their occupations as pejorative criticism of nomadic groups. If vss. 17-24 remained in their present context unrelated to the Cain-Abel episode, if they were mechanically appended to illustrate the spread of sin and the pride of blood- thirsty nomads then the interpretation stands. On the other hand if the redactor utilized the list to fill out the genealogy of the foolish Cain, one finds a different meaning for the occupations.

With a name as the only datum given, little can be done without entering the world of imaginative exegesis. Thus Irad, Mehujael, Methushael, Adah, Zillah, and Naamah defy further comment. Yet Enoch, Lamech, Jabal, Jubal, and Tubal-Cain provide a modicum of data. Concerning Jabal as the eponymous ancestor of pastoral nomads, one should include the idea that the chief labor of this group was shepherding. On one level a rustic livelihood traditionally mobile but dependent upon the village; on another level shepherding would conjure ideas of men ruling over others, protecting, holding authority and responsibility. Of Jubal the relation of music to the activity of the early prophets and divination has been suggested. One may recall Tubal-Cain's skill in transforming raw earth into magnificent artifacts and the awe this occasioned in the reflective man. And finally in Lamech the gate of blood opened by Cain has widened to the atrocities committed for the slightest of

reasons.

The question then is how does the J author regard these figures in the light of the norm he has adopted with respect to Cain.

1) The first city is either founded by or associated with the man of blood, a fugitive, Cain,

2) The first city is either built by or named after Enoch (all personal traits have been suppressed by J.),

3) The descendents Irad, Mehujael, and Methushael have no distinction,

4) Lamech's sons are important:

a) Jabal, a figure for those who shepherd; did they do so wisely of foolishly?

b) Jubal, a figure of those who through a medium knew the mind of Yahweh; were they wise or foolish?

c) Tubal-Cain, a figure for those whose wisdom was great and mysterious; did it make him truly wise or foolish?

5) Lamech himself, who brings full round the figure of the man of blood.[71]

---

71 Such an interpretation does not address itself to the question of the historical plausibility of these professions at the time of the J author. The fine analysis of R. North, JBL 83(1964), pp. 373-389, of the genealogy in terms of it representing a gypsy band of Kenites, pariahs of civilized folk may be entirely accurate but fails to consider 4:17's coloring of all the descendants. The point of reference is the city or town for these rovers, if such they were. Is the J author content to give the reader a rough sketch of a few pariah professions as the sum of civilization from Adam to Noah? And if the Kenites are the laughing-stock of Israel, the butt of the "Polish-joke syndrome" why is the remainder of contemporary literature so favorable to them? Thus one must attempt to see the author's intention in the light of the entire corpus and the social, religious and political currents of his day. Of greater importance will be the author's use of the model rather than its historical feasibility.

XUM

Thus the J author has in ch. 4 brought together various materials around the figure of Cain whom J has placed as firstborn of Adam, and set ch. 4 within the framework of the primeval history's theme of the spread of sin. As McKenzie and Alonso-Schökel have demonstrated in their analysis of the Creation and Fall narratives, J can also include a significance for the individual episodes which would allow the story to stand apart from the primeval history.[72] McKenzie has suggested the relation of the Canaanite fertility cult as standing behind the figure of the snake (tempter) without attempting to pinpoint a specific shrine, festival or act of the people or king which would anchor the narrative in the reigns of Saul through Solomon. The data in ch. 3 are too generalized perhaps to permit such a correlation. Likewise in ch. 4, J has taken the figure of the irascible and foolish Cain, detailed the personal consequences of his folly (8-16), and continued with his descendants (17-24). However, in the genealogy his material limited him to a few brief innuendoes regarding the origin of city life, and how wise are those who shepherd (Jabal), divine (Jubal), and created artifacts (Tubal-Cain) or live by the law of blood (Lamech), professions which are not, strictly speaking, nomadic, nor in the wake of v. 17 to be considered such, but whose sustenance is dependent on the urban economy. At the same time they are landless, in keeping with Cain's curse.

The final suggestion to be made is the possibility that the J writer wished to instruct the royal court concerning certain unwise acts of its own. It may

---

72 McKenzie, TS 15(1954), pp. 541-572; also, Alonso-Schökel, Biblica 43(1962), pp. 295-315.

be that J wished to draw attention to the acts of Solomon (which a later writer would report in I Kgs. 11).[73] Was Solomon a true shepherd-king whose flock was his only interest, or had regal policies exceeded the most tolerant reason? Was what passed for cult in the temple and the high places to be Yahweh's motive for cutting Solomon's heirs from the land (1 Kgs. 9:1-14)? Was the opulence of the kingdom, the city, and the temple not a monument to superficial wisdom and foolish pride? And how was a house to stand that had been secured by murder and intrigue? Writing in the manner of the author of II Sam. 12:1-5 and 14:1-20 but without the confidence that Solomon would respond so graciously as David to rebuke, the Yahwist leaves his instructions for the royal person in generalities concerning social groups found in the realm.

B. NARRATIVES CONCERNING BABEL: GENESIS 11:1-9

The concluding episode in the primeval history is the short narrative concerning the city and tower of Babel.

1. LITERARY CRITICISM

Gunkel proposed that the redactor of 11:1-9 wove together two independent stories, a Stadtrezension (1, 3a, 4ad, γ, 6ad, B, 7, 8b, 9a) and

---

[73] I Kgs. 11:1-13 records the misdeeds of Solomon quite in keeping with the standards of Dt. 7:1-4. Solomon had married repeatedly for political reasons, and had erected shrines within view of Jerusalem to the foreign gods of his wives. Although the acts are reported by an author later than J it does not preclude their having occurred within the view of J.

XUM

a Turmbaurezension (2, 4aB, b, 3b, 5, 6a , b, 8a, 9b).[74] He reasons that several clues within the composite work indicate a separation needed: 1) the Lord comes down in v. 5, yet he re-descends in v. 7, 2) the motives for building v. 4b "lest we be dispersed", 3) in v. 9a the Lord confuses their speech, in 9b he disperses them, 4) redundancies also occur between 8a and 8b, 3a and 3b.

Another approach is that of Speiser who has sought a Babylonian literary model as the source namely, the Enuma Elish VI, 47-73 (ANET, pp. 68-69).[75] He develops three points of contact: 1) "the solemn preparation of the bricks", 2) "the building of the stage tower", and 3) "the refer-

---

[74] Gunkel, Genesis, pp. 92-101. The acceptability of Gunkel's analysis has been questioned by most later critics. Driver does not allude to it, Skinner agrees with Gunkel; on the other hand Cassuto rejects it, Genesis II, pp. 236-238, Von Rad agrues for a unity, Genesis, pp. 143-148. Cf. also, O. E. Ravn. "Der Turm zu Babel," ZDMG, 91(1937), pp. 352-372. J. Prado, "La Ciudad y Torre de Babel," Es Bibl, 9 (1950), pp. 273-294. A. Frenz, "Der Turmbau," VT, 19(1969), pp. 183-195. B. Stade, "Beiträge zur Pentateuchkritik; A. Der Turm zu Babel," ZAW 15(1895), pp. 157-166. E. G. Kraeling, "The Tower of Babel" JAOS 40(1920), pp. 276-281.

[75] E. A. Speiser, "Word Plays on the Creation Epic's Version of the Founding of Babylon," Orientalia 25(1956), pp. 317-323. Kapelrud relates that Gudea, ensi of Lagash, was rewarded for building a temple to Ningirsu, the status of a divine king seated among the gods in their great assembly, Orientalia 32(1963), pp. 57-58. This may be the intent of v. 6 "how far will their enterprise continue?" Kapelrud reads I Kgs. 3:5 concerning Solomon as parallel to Gudea but the wisdom theme intrudes (3:9) and "has probably driven other themes, originally connected with this dream, aside".

XUM

ence to the 'head in the heavens'".[76] To these Kramer has added a fourth, the confusion of tongues, which he discovers parallelled in the epic tale "Enmerkar and the Lord of Aratta".[77] As subtle as Speiser's arguments are there is little doubt that the biblical narrative has a Babylonian background, and, tentatively one may believe, literary model.

As attractive as Gunkel's suggestion to divide the narrative may be, one is inclined to accept the initial distinctness of the stories but posit a union at an early date so that the J writer received them joined. This is not to say that he has transcribed them without his own touch. While there is good argument for a vocabulary peculiar to the Stadtrezension and another for the Turmbaurezension they are enough significant interchanges to believe that the J author has infused the whole with his style. For example כל-הארץ may be found in Recension A (Stadt.) 1a and 9a; in Recension B (Turmbau) 2b, 4b, and 9b; יהוה in A: 5a, 6a, 9a, but also in B: 8a and 9b. Thus in terms of the present study the unity of the passage is accepted.

---

[76] Ibid., p. 322. The author of the present study is in full agreement with Speiser that the biblical writer used a literary model rather than an architectural one. It is immaterial to argue which ziggurat was the case in point. Cf. also, W. G. Lambert, "A New Look at the Babylonian Background of Genesis," JTS, 16(1965), pp. 287-300. J. Dombart, "Der Turmbau zu Babel," OLZ 21(1918), pp. 161-165. H. Quiring, "Sintflut, Stufenturm und erstes Gotteshaus," Saeculum 1(1950), pp. 397-404. A. Parrot, The Tower of Babel, (London, 1955), 75 pp; idem, Babylon and the Old Testament (London, 1958), 166 pp.

[77] S. Kramer, "The 'Babel of Tongues': A Sumerian Version," JAOS 88(1968), pp. 108-111.

XUM

2. COMMENT

In the Babylonian version the grateful gods build a city and a throne for their triumphant Marduk to celebrate the defeat of Tiamat, the ordering of the universe and the creation of man. The Enûma elish herein recounts the fundamentals of the origin of the city and its purpose. The earthly equivalent is justified because the gods have done so in the heavenly realm already. The terrestrial images in a real and mythical way what is divine.[78] The Sumerian fragment Kramer published (Cf. n. 77) relates the antagonism between Enlil and Enki, the god of wisdom. The latter disrupts the unity of the Enlil people by confusing their speech. Therefore the Mesopotamian literature suggests that the city and its crown, the tower, comprised a unit while the confusion of tongues and consequent dispersal formed another.

The J author has recast them to express the heights to which man's pride will lead him and the consequences of his folly. In the Enûma elish the Annunaki, the lesser gods, construct the city and the tower to give glory to Marduk, their king; in Genesis mortals unite to build a city and tower to make a name for themselves. The result of the former is harmony among the gods; of the latter, confusion and dispersal of mankind.

In recasting it, J has shifted attention to the pride and arrogance of men and the foolish conclusion of those who plan and scheme without Yahweh. He has taken bold steps in purging the Babylonian version of its "gods", and by projecting the scene in the theatre of men he has demythologized it. And

---

78 Cf. Th. Jacobsen, Before Philosophy, p. 193.

in taking the earthly image of Babylonian divine glory he has hewn a figure of the pride of all mankind.

There are points of contrast between this narrative and the Abraham narrative worth noting. The people of Babel assemble and say: "let us make a name for ourselves", whereas Yahweh addresses Abraham: "and I will make of you a great nation, and I will bless you, and make your name great". 12:2. Yahweh foresees that the pride of the people of Babel will be without limit:

וזה החלם לעשות ועתה לא-יבצר מהם כל אשר יזמו לעשות 11:6.

On the other hand Abraham does only as he is commanded; he passes "through the land to the place at Shechem (12:6), and there he built an altar (12:7) to Yahweh and again at Bethel (12:8). At Babel they construct a city and a tower of bricks and mortar while Abraham had only "movable property" (12:5), and lived in "tents" (12:8). The result of his faith will be the making of a great nation, and the blessing of all families of the earth (12:3).

Therefore, J has not only recast the ancient material to form the Babel narrative of 11:1-9 but has also placed it strategically at the climax of the primeval history and just prior to the opening episodes of the patriarchal history. The importance of these points of contact will become more limpid as one perceives the author's continued use of wisdom motifs in 11: 1-9.

The horror of Babel to J was the aggrandizement that the people's pride had reached so that they would provide their own guarantee of their name. The parade passage for comparison is II Sam. 7:1-29 wherein David desires

XUM

to build a temple for "the ark of God dwells in a tent" (v. 2). However, God desires neither palace (1,2) nor temple (5, 6, 7) of David; he himself will establish the family and dynasty of David (18, 25, 26, 27, 29) as his monument.[79] Only in v. 13 does Yahweh indicate that a physical building would be constructed and that by a son of David. Name-building is the function of Yahweh (9, 23, 26) not of the king (1 Kgs. 10:6, 23-29) or the people (1 Kgs. 1:47).[80] Hiram of Tyre appears to build a place for David (II Sam. 5:11-12) of cedar and stone but the glory is given to Yahweh not David.[81]

In Pr. 10:7 the "righteous-wicked" antithesis is apparent:

> "The memory of the righteous is a blessing,
> but the name of the wicket will rot away."

Those of Babel are people of means, yet Abraham was also a man of wealth (Gen. 24:34-35, 13:2). Wealth itself is not the root of evil, but what one owns is its root and how one disposes of it, the consequence. Abraham blessed the Lord and was counted great; the reward at Babel was confusion of tongues and dispersal, the fragmentation of their name.[82]

Bildad offers Job a grim picture of the fate of the wicked man (Job 18:1-21);

---

[79] The Deuteronomic historian refers back to this in 1 Kgs. 8: 16-20, words placed in the mouth of Solomon.

[80] Cf. Psalm 72:17

> May his name endure forever
> his fame continue as long as the sun!
> May men bless themselves by him
> all nations call him blessed!

[81] Cf. 1 Kgs. 5:3-5 wherein Solomon lures Hiram back to build a temple.

[82] Cf. Pedersen, Israel, I-II, pp. 248-249.

XUM

in particular the thought:

> "His memory perishes from the earth
> and he has no name in the street." 18:17

The sense of the phrase "let us make a name for ourselves" gained from the various usages is that of perpetuating one's presence.[83] Having children and building monuments are time honored ways men have sought to extend their presence beyond the summons of death. The first is a gift from Yahweh, the second can only be achieved if carried out in his name and with his help. The grand enterprise of Solomon may be seen as attempting to fulfill the need not only to legitimate his ascendency but also his prolific efforts to perpetuate his name. That the J author has Solomon's building projects at Jerusalem in sight and mind as he wrote of Babel can only be suggested at this time.[84]

Their arrogance in 11:6 compels Yahweh to confuse their speech in v. 7. Proverbs deals with arrogance and its fruit in 11:2.

> "Where there is arrogance, disgrace follows
> but wisdom is with those who are modest."[85]

or

> "Before a crash a man's mind is lifted up in pride
> but before honor comes humility."[86]

---

83 Note Pr. 18:10

> The name of the Lord is a strong tower,
> the righteous man runs into it and is safe.
> A rich man's wealth is his strong city,
> and like a high wall protecting him.
> Before destruction a man's heart is haughty,
> but humility goes before honor.

84 Cf. supra pp. 92-93.

85 McKane, Proverbs, p. 226, 428.

86 Ibid, p. 239.

in particular:

> "Pride of eye and pride of mind,
> the tilth of the wicked (produces) sin."[87]

wherein men act as if they were God exceeding the bounds in megalomaniac pride. This is surely the picture of the people in 11:6. What they construct is a tower, the antithesis of which may be found in Pr. 14:1:

> "Wisdom has built her house
> but Folly demolished it with her hands."[88]

The tower is an infrequent symbol in the early literature; when it does appear it is not used pejoratively (cf. Judges 9:46-52, 8:9-17; II Sam. 22:51(?)). However, the image of Wisdom as a house (9:1-6) which offers insight and learning to all who desire may be very old.[89] In contrast what the wicked build will come down of its own or by the power of Yahweh (Pr. 12:12; 14:11; 15:25).

The normal sense of זמם (11:6) in wisdom refers to mental agility such as that needed by a statesman as in Pr. 8:12; however another sense appears in Pr. 12:2; 24:8; Ps. 10:2; 21:11; 37:7; Job 21:27. It is this latter one which seems to be J's intent in 11:6. The counterpart to the idea of men scheming and "proposing" has already been touched on while discussing Cain's arrogance in expecting to know the mind of Yahweh.[90]

---

[87] Ibid., p. 243, 558-559.

[88] Ibid., p. 231, 472.

[89] Cf. W. F. Albright, "Some Canaanite-Phoenician Sources of Hebrew Wisdom," SVT, 3(1955), pp. 8-9.

[90] Cf. above pp. 138-139.

XUM

Therefore the narrative is replete with wisdom concerns which help close out the primeval history on the note that men left to themselves are blundering idiots, prone to a course of self-destructive folly. But these shortcomings will be attended shortly in the appearance of Abraham. The separation of city and tower seems thematically unwarranted. A great city would have its tower, as much as a modest modern town would have its church spire. The image of the ziggurat as the crown of the city is better suited to the actual city-temple complexes of ancient Mesopotamian than the figure of the ziggurat standing apart from the urban site.

It cannot be concluded from the narrative that the Yahwist decries urban town-planning or temple building in themselves. Nor are they mere symbols of his disgust with technocracy, nor can it be said that "it is only in an urban civilization that man has the metaphysical possibility of saying, 'I have killed God'."[91]

In simple terms it states that men who possess the technical know-how to construct a city and a great tower are foolish if they attempt it without Yahweh. The sin of pride found here is generically the same hubris as in ch. 3 and 4; the specific act differs. The confusion of tongues and dispersal of men is only loosely connected with the Table of Nations in Ch. 10. They were cut off from the land in which their security rested. They were as Job

---

91 Cf. J. Ellul, The Meaning of the City, (Grand Rapids, 1970), p. 16. Ellul's approach to the text differs little from the old scholastic proof-text procedure. Once one is settled on the truth of one's thesis, one may mine the Scriptures to enrich it.

states:

> "Sons of base men and sons even of nameless men
> They were cut off out of the land." (Job. 30:8) [92]

This was the fate of the foolish, to be without land of their own, to be nameless, to wander. The בני-נבל is reminiscent of 1 Sam. 25:25 in which Abigail entreats David to disregard her mulish husband:

> "Let not my lord regard this ill-natured
> fellow, Nabal; for as his name is, so is he;
> Nabal is his name, and folly is with him;"

Etymologically נבל is someone who is stigmatized or branded, usually lacking sense (Pr. 17:21), and sometimes moral sense (Is. 32:5). Tamar warns Amnon that he will become as a wanton fool in Israel if he assaults her (II Sam. 13:13); Job reprimands his wife to keep still or be a foolish woman (Job 2:10). Psalm 53:1-5 depects the lot of the fool as one scattered by God for he did not call on Him.

It is not J's desire that Israel not have the fruits of urban civilization, its cities, temples and wealth, but that she use them wisely, heedful of their origin and purpose. The fool can be anyone who does not see things in perspective, the wise man owns his responsibility for the material world. He affirms this in the decisions he makes with regard to it. In David the Israelites saw a man who lived fully, sometimes too much but never too little. In Solomon an excess was being reached which could only occasion the thought: where does this kind of involvement in materialism lead?

---

92 E. Dhorme, A Commentary on the Book of Job, trans. H. Knight, (Leiden, 1967), p. 435.

Recently Wallis has analyzed these texts, Gen. 4:1-26, 11:1-9, and reached conclusions somewhat different from those presented above.[93] The texts betray, according to Wallis, a "silent aversion" for urban life which is a residual of the days when the people had lived the free lifestyle of the Kleinviehnomaden. These stories tell of a "secret horror" ancient Israel had for the city. Unfortunately, Wallis has remained wedded to the sociology of Wellhausen and his successors, and therefore sees the city as an element quite foreign to the spirit of the Israelites.[94] During the settlement period the Israelite had adapted to urbanization, but with reluctance. One must view with reserve the validity of this approach to the narratives since so many of the presumptions rest on a theory of cultural evolution no longer supported by current cultural anthropology; the approach also supposes a massive intrusion of alien nomads into Canaan in the 12th century for which data is lacking.[95] If Mendenhall is correct in holding that the bulk of the Israelite population was native to Canaan then Wallis presents a view representative of but a small minority, a view restricted in later literature to the Rechabites. Thus the present study, accepting conclusions current in cultural anthropology regarding the relation of agriculture, nomadism and urbanization

---

93 G. Wallis, "Die Stadt in den Überlieferungen der Genesis," ZAW 78(1966), pp. 133-148.

94 Cf. A. Glock, CTM, 41(1970), pp. 559-560.

95 Cf. G. Mendenhall, Biblica 50(1969), pp. 432-436, a review of M. Weippert, Die Landnahme der israelitischen Stämme in der neuern wissenschaftlichen Diskussion.

has sought the key to these narratives not in sociology but within the historical and cultural provenance of the Yahwist.[96]

C. SODOM AND GOMORRAH

The narrative of Sodom and Gomorrah contains the stories of Abraham and Lot, 13:1-13 and 18:1-19:28. The ingenious reconstruction of the Traditionsgeschichte by Noth in which he sees three independent figures brought together illustrates the complexity of the material.[96] The narrative of 13:1-13 relates how and why Lot separated from Abraham and came to settle in Sodom. The story of 18:1-15 tells of the visit of the messengers of Yahweh (and Yahweh) to Abraham at Mamre, the intercession of Abraham in behalf of Sodom in 22-23. Ch. 19:1-28 deals with the demise of Sodom and Lot's rescue.

1. ABRAHAM AND LOT SEPARATE: GENESIS 13:2-13

LITERARY CRITICISM

Some traces of editorial activity may be found in 13:3-4 as they repeat the thought of 12:8. That they are J cannot be doubted as the phrase in v. 4: corresponds to

13:4 ויקרא שם אברם יהוה ; 4:26: ויקרא....בשם יהוה

Also in v. 7 כנעני for Canaanites, the phrase אל-נא

---

96 Cf. F. Frick, The City, pp. 79-87, 312 ff. Also, cf. supra pp. 22-29.

97 Noth, Pentateuch, pp. 151-154. He reasons: 1) Haran, pious man of Beth-Haran, 2) Lot, a hermit of Zoar, and 3) a pious man of Hebron-Mamre later identified as Abraham, formed the sources from which the present narrative arose, presumably, at Hebron-Mamre.

in 8 and 9, the relation of כבן-יהוה v. 10 to 2:10-14, the peculiar phrasing of ויסע...מקדם v. 11 and 11:2, the rare usage of אהל as a denominative verb in v. 12 and 18, and finally the divine name in 4, 10, and 13 would indicate the hand of J in all save 6, 11b, 12abd which is P. Simpson would prefer to see a gloss in v. 1: (1)ולוט, (2) עמו, and attribute 3 and 4 to J^2 because it repeats 12:8. As it may be anticipated, Fohrer gives 13:1-5, 7-11a, 12b-13 to N, and Eissfeldt 13:2, 5, 7-11a, 12b-13 to L.[98] Gunkel has analyzed no less than five separable literary sources here: J^a=2, 5, 7a, 8-10ad, 11a, 12b-13, J^b=1, J^r=3-4, P=6, 11b-12a, X (a later unidentifiable redactor)= 7b, 10ab. Such precision is deft but precarious, which may demand a late dating for the final redaction. It is the view of this writer that, aside from the P insertions, the J material in toto was complete by the tenth century. Nothing in it necessitates a later date.

2. COMMENT

The narrative is a bridge between Abram's movements in ch. 12 and the twofold topics of ch. 18-19, viz., Abram's blessing of child by Sarah 18:1-16 and Lot's unwise choice of a dwelling place 18:20-19:28. Abram is rich "in cattle, silver and gold" (v. 2, also 23:16; 24:35); 12:16 relates

---

98 Eissfeldt, Introduction, pp. 187-188, 194. Fohrer, Introduction, p. 161.

that Pharaoh gave Abram gifts of male and female servants, and much livestock, but apparently he already had wealth before entering Egypt. Albright's view that Abram was a prosperous merchant plying the ass-caravan route from Damascus to Egypt is appealing. Then Shechem, Hebron and Gerar would be trade centers on the caravan route known as well for their stock of donkeys. He writes: "Abraham was not a semi-nomad but a resident alien (ger) here (Hebron) as in Gerar".[99] His business would keep him on the road most of the year without his need to be a nomad. If his occupation was wool then he might very well have had a need for large pasture land for his flocks and herdsmen. Von Rad has observed the symbiotic balance which obtains between the herdsmen and the resident farmer in such an economy.[100]

The strife which occurs between the herdsmen of Abram and Lot becomes the motive for their separation.[101] The note that at that time the Canaanites and Perizzites inhabited the area poses some problems; it is easier to state what it does not signify rather than what it does. It cannot mean that they had been exterminated since Abram's time, nor may Canaanites be exclusively understood as an ethnic group. The Perizzites have been explained as villagers of unwalled towns from פרזות or as migrant metal workers. At least they were more probably a social class, just as Canaanites were associated with those who dwell in fortified towns in 10:18-19. Thus the

---

99 W. F. Albright, BASOR, 163(1961), p. 48.

100 Von Rad, Genesis, p. 166.

101 Cf. B. Gemser, "The Rib- or Controversy-pattern in Hebrew Mentality," SVT, 3(1955), p. 120, 136-137.

text suggests that Abram and Lot should be understood in the light of the background the explanatory remark provides, viz., as related to but not the same as the Canaanites and Perizzites.

There are two concerns in this narrative which relate to the Cain of Gen. 4:2-16. The Yahwist has set a new tone in 12:1-4 regarding the fate of man.[102] In Abraham all the nations were to receive their blessing long denied because of the curses of 3:14, 17; 4:11, 13; 9:25; 11:9. Working with independent stories, J builds upon the portrait of Abram the man of blessing because he had true wisdom, fear of the Lord. In the present context he avoids a violent end to the quarreling of his and Lot's herdsmen. There was insufficient grazing land for both flocks according to J; the land could not support the two men for their possessions were too great according to P (v. 6). Abram not only offers to divide the land between his nephew and himself but he will allow the younger man his choice.

It is the wise man who takes steps to avoid the quarrel for no one knows its end:

> "The beginning of strife is like letting out water,
> so quit before the quarrel breaks out." Pr. 17:14
>
> "It is an honor for a man to keep aloof from strife
> but every fool will be quarreling." 20:3
>
> "Scoffers set a city aflame
> but wisemen turn away wrath." 29:8
>
> "A fool gives vent to his anger
> but a wise man quietly holds it back." 29:11

---

102 Cf. H. W. Wolff, Interpretation 20(1966), pp. 137-147.

Abram reasons with Lot that it is unseemly for kinsmen to quarrel (v. 8) therefore a settlement is in order. Notice that the quarrel is between herdsmen not between the "nomad" and the "sedentary farmer". It could very well be between neighboring merchants, fellow enclosed nomads, resident but alien cattlemen, or simply native herders. As the episode indicates the tension does not occur on the level of the "classic struggle between the roving shepherds and the settled peasant".

If Noth's hypothesis that the figure of Isaac is older than Abraham be true, (viz., that stories originally belonging to the Isaac-cycle have been given to the Hebron Abraham), then the quarrel in Gen. 26:20-22 between Isaac and the men of Gerar in J should be regarded as older than Abraham's quarrel with Abimelech in Gen. 21:25 in E. Isaac also avoids a violent confrontation by digging successive wells until the natives cease claiming them. Thus Isaac has done as his father before him and his son after him (Gen. 32: 4-14a; 33:1-3, 6-7, 12-16).

Unlike Cain who allowed his anger to overpower him, Abram appears calm and generous, one through whom blessings will flow instead of curses. This is the first point of contact with Cain. The second concerns Lot's opportunity to choose and the wisdom of his choice.

A lesson from the primeval history is that men are to be held accountable for their decisions and that they are free to choose life or death. The present narrative sustains the former but only foreshadows the latter. The full impact of his choice is not revealed until 19:1-28. He selects the well-watered

XUM

Jordan plain, compared by J to the garden of Yahweh an allusion to 2:10-14 or the Nile delta.[103] P adds that Abram dwelt in Canaan and Lot in the cities of the plain, however, J passes from the statement that Lot departed eastward to the plain of Jordan as far as Sodom to the ominous remark that "the men of Sodom were exceedingly wicked and sinful to Yahweh".

3. NARRATIVES CONCERNING THE JUDGMENT OVER SODOM AND GOMORRAH, AND THE DESTRUCTION OF THEM: GENESIS 18:16-33, 19:1-28

LITERARY CRITICISM

Two aspects of the lively account in 18:1-15 may be underscored with reference to the Sodom saga: 1) the dual mission of the אנשים (18:2, 16, 22; 19:5, 8) to bear the news of Sarah's blessing and Sodom's curse 2) the hospitality of Abram and inhospitality of the men of Sodom. The passage throughout is thoroughly J: יהוה in 1, 13, 14; ירץ לראה used only in J here and 24:17; 29:13; 33:4; נא in 3 twice, 4; עבדך in 3, 5; מצאתי חן in 3, כי-על-כן in 5; למח זה in 13.

With regard to 18:16-21 some remarks have been made above.[104] 18:16 should be followed by 18:33b as 18:17-22a contains the soliloquy of Yahweh and 22b-33a the dialogue of Yahweh and Abraham. In 18:17-19 Yahweh pledges his commitment to Abraham and his offspring. Two reasons

---

103 Regarding the true location of Sodom and Gomorrah one may consult F.G. Clapp, "The Site of Sodom and Gomorrah: diversity of views," Am.J. Arch. (1936), pp. 323-344. Also, J.P. Harland, "Sodom and Gomorrah," BA, 5(1942), pp. 17-32, 6(1943), pp. 41-54.

104 Cf. p. 177, n. 19.

are adduced in v. 19 for this commitment: 1) Yahweh has ידעתיו Abraham so that his descendants would observe צדקה and משפט , 2) so that the promises of 12:1-3 will be fulfilled. Although the section continues the promise motif of 1-16 there is a pronounced theologizing comparable to 28:13-16 regarding Jacob. Verses 20-22a renew the Sodom thread in a manner recalling 11:5, 7, Yahweh comes down to inspect the scene before giving judgment, also, the outcry, though not of blood, summons Yahweh as in 4:10. But J has leaked the judgment to his audience in 13:9 and the end of the bargaining in 22b-33a is foreknown.

Wellhausen has discerned that 22b-33a is an editorial insertion and well it may be. It does express the question of the relative value of good men in a community, and whether or not they should be destroyed with the wicked. The passage is unmistakedly J in the use of יהוה, נא, הללה in 25, הפעם in 32.

The saga of Sodom and Gomorrah has been taken as a nature or place saga by Eissfeldt, Weiser and Fohrer.[105] It is J but Gunkel would see the hand of J^r in 17-22. It contains the usual signs of J: הנה נא in 2, 8, 19, 20; נא alone in 2, 7, 18, 20; כי-על-כן in 8; יהוה in 13, 14, 16, 24, 27.

4. COMMENT

The city of Sodom is the locus in 18:22-33 for the dialogue on the wicked רשע and the righteous צדיק . Von Rad notes that the city of

---

105 Eissfeldt, Introduction, p. 39. Weiser, Introduction, p. 60. Fohrer, Introduction, p. 90.

Sodom is judged according to the same principle that Yahweh would use for covenanted Israel.[106] Sodom is a stock example over which Yahweh will pronounce judgment. Its relation to the Sodom of 19:1-28 is not original but due to the hand of J. Wellhausen has posited a late date for the narrative because it reflects a more thoughtful period when the questions of individual responsibility and how one man's righteousness may "make up" for another's evil were topical. However the subject of the individual's relationship to his community has already been raised in 4:9.[107]

Why do the wicked prosper while the righteous subsist? Why do the righteous fall in the same disaster that overtakes the wicked? The narrative argues the principle that the righteousness of one man is greater than the evil of another. But how much greater? The dialogue proceeds from fifty just men in the city which would be sufficient to save it down to ten, but ten cannot be found so the question remains open. Dt. 21:1-9 relates that the crime of murder by one man pollutes the entire city until atonement is made, here the Yahwist asks if the reversal might not be true. The question is by no means idle for it goes beyond the old wisdom of Job's sages that the righteous will enjoy well-being while the wicked get their own desert. Closer in thought would be Pr. 11:11:

> "By the blessing of the upright a city is exacted,
> but it is overthrown by the mouth of the wicked."

---

106 Von Rad, Genesis, p. 207.

107 Cf. the discussion concerning 4:9 on 134, 141 above. Also, Speiser, Genesis, p. 135.

The J writer had in hand the experience of an obscure event of the past, the disappearance of a city of the Jordan plain, infamous for its depravity, now the site of rock salt, bitumen, and viscid swamps of the lower Dead Sea. The experience was not his own nor that of his contemporaries but may have been only that of the continued recital of the saga of Sodom.[108] It was enough to illustrate the larger issue of one's responsibility to the community's welfare. Abraham's concern is not only the salvation of the few righteous but also that their righteousness would effectively deliver the entire community from Yahweh's judgment. As the following narrative unfolds it is not known whether Lot himself was righteous enough to effect the safety of his own family; Lot's good fortune appears due to his relationship to Abraham, the man through whom blessings flow. Proverbs 11:21 holds that the righteous will be delivered while the evil are punished.[109] However, Gen. 18:22-33 introduces the idea of vicarious righteousness, Abraham for Lot.

The sexual depravity of Sodom is the negative pole in ch. 19:1-11 while Lot's hospitality forms the positive. Homosexuality is infrequently a subject in the Old Testament but from the few passages relating it, the practice is fiercely condemned. Here and in Jdgs. 19:22 the men of the town surround the house in which a traveller is resting for the night; the host offers his virgin daughter in place of his guest and terrible punishment befalls the sinners. The Gibeah incident's connection with Sodom saga

---

108 The recital continues in the prophets Isaiah, Jerimiah, Amos, and Ezekiel; note also its use in the late work, the Book of the Wisdom of Solomon 10:6-8.

109 Many proverbs attest the same attitude: Pr. 11:30; 12:12, 21; 13:9.

is uncertain.[110] The unbridled lust of Gibeah is bisexual because they engaged in the night-long raping of the Levite's concubine once they knew they could not have the man; however in Sodom the men would not accept Lot's daughters. Also the story in Judges has a tribal setting wherein the Benjaminites were punished by the tribal federation for what must have been a covenant violation. On the other hand, Yahweh annihilates Sodom and its inhabitants with only the city as the circuit of punishment.

The prohibitions in Lev. 18:6-23 include the stipulation in 22: "You shall not lie with a male as with a woman; it is an abomination; they shall be put to death, their blood is upon them". Homosexuality is linked with a cult practice by implication by means of the word "abomination". In the Holiness Code (Lev. 17-26) Israel is a "holy" people and such practices by individual members defile the community unless satisfaction is made, in this case, death. But again it is difficult to determine whether or not the Yahwist has such a cult practice in mind. Von Rad is of the opinion that sexual aberrations among the Canaanites, in particular the erotic and orgiastic cult of Baal and Astarte, were common and abhorred by the Israelites.[111] The Yahwist had dealt with Israelite involvement in Canaanite fertility cults in ch. 3 and has perhaps taken this opportunity to rail against the abuses once more. Male cult prostitution continued in Israel and Judah down through the divided monarchy (1 Kgs. 14:24; 15:12-13; 22:46) up to the reform of Josiah

---

[110] G. F. Moore, Judges, The International Critical Commentary, 6th inpr. (Edinburgh, 1949), pp. 417-420 is of the opinion that Judges is dependent on the incident in Genesis.

[111] Von Rad, Genesis, p. 212.

XUM

(II Kgs. 23:7; also, Dt. 23:17-18). Thus there was a current practice in the Yahwist's time, perhaps to be linked with the Solomonic temple, of Canaanite fertility cult including the vice of "the dog" which he may have had in mind. It must be recognized in view of the various notions regarding the nature of the sin of Sodom in later literature,[112] that the Yahwist interpretation specifically emphasized sexual perversion.

The narrative is not recording an historical event such as the quake of San Francisco, but seeks to interpret the experience the saga conveys. J does it with a view towards providing a guide to decision concerning a real abuse in his own day. The story also provides a prologue to the etiological tale of the incestuous origins of Moab and Ammon. It may only be suggested at this point, that the Yahwist used the story to vilify the temple practices introduced by Solomon to accomodate his foreign wives and relatives. Among these practices, many or all of which were erotic, was cultic homosexuality.[113]

Lot's attempts at hospitality mirror those of Abraham in ch. 18. They do contrast with the prospect of passing the night in the town square. Yet Lot appears dimwitted when told to leave. His sons-in-law regard him as a comic, his wife paid him no heed and joined the scenery; and whereas he thought big in ch. 13 in choosing the fertile plain now he is content with a hillside cave near a town known by its insignificance. On the other hand

---

112 Is. 1:9-10; 3:9 in which injustice among the judges is the sin; Ezk. 16: 48-49 where the prosperous Sodomites would not help the poor and needy; Jer. 23:14 adultery and resolute evil doers make Jerusalem another Sodom.

113 Cf. B. A. Brooks, "Fertility Cult Functionaries in the Old Testament," JBL 60(1941), pp. 227-253; also M. Astour, "Tamar the Hierodule," JBL 85(1966), pp. 185-196; R. DeVaux, Ancient Israel, p. 384.

It is his hospitality which may have been his only claim to righteousness.[114] But difficulties remain in assessing his act of hospitality.

Much of what modern commentators relate concerning the "law of hospitality", is based on the analogy of social customs prevalent among modern desert tribes.[115] Briefly it may be summarized: a stranger arriving in the townsquare is invited to an evening meal by a host; he may spend the night or up to three days (the duration of the first meal within him). The custom was observed both in the desert[116] and in the town.[117] In a short dispute between the nomad, Zeyd, and the townsman, Dowlany, as to which was closer to Allah the nomad wins because the people of Damascus would not grant him hospitality on one of his journeys.[118] The light this testimony sheds on Gen. 19 is welcome but limited for neither in ch. 19 nor 18, nor Jdgs. 19 is the guest to remain more than a night. That there was a custom of hospitality in the Yahwist's time must be granted. However, it cannot be deduced from the texts in question that Abraham's and Lot's hospitality were

---

114 EB, II, cols. 2128-2189.

115 One of the most frequently cited studies is that of W. R. Smith's Lectures on the Religion of the Semites: The Fundamental Institutions, third ed. (New York, 1969), pp. 75-77. See also, Pedersen, Israel I-II pp. 356-358.

116 Smith, Religion of the Semites, p. 76.

117 C. M. Doughty, Travels in Arabic Deserta, abridged by E. Garnett, (New York, 1953), p. 57.

118 Ibid,

representative of nomadic custom and are set over and against the city of Sodom's inhospitality through the saga of Sodom.[119]

The men of Sodom regard Lot himself as an alien sojourning among them (19:9 לגור) and rebuke him for acting as their judge. It may be that another facet of the original story has been suppressed here. It was customary that the alien acknowledge the local deities while a guest; Abraham performs his duty at Shechem 12:6-8, near Bethel 13:3-4, at Hebron 13:18, at Salem 14:19-20. Therefore in Lot's going down to Sodom it might be presumed that he would have entered the worship in Sodom; the degree of sexual perversion that Lot had become inured to is only indicated in 19:30-38. The anger of the men of Sodom turns on Lot because he now judges them whereas before he had acted as one of them. In view of this the point may be noted that the Yahwist has omitted any details regarding Lot's acknowledgement of Sodom's cult lest it take away from fact that Lot's guests as divine messengers of Yahweh would acknowledge Yahweh's power by destroying Sodom. It is the righteousness of Abraham, Lot's uncle and intercessor, that saves Lot from the same fate as the rest of Sodom but does not signify that Lot was not contaminated by the depravity of Sodom as the incestuous origins of Moab and Ammon relate.

---

119 In the Book of Jashar 19:25 Sodom appears to have a law of inhospitality: "and all the people of Sodom caused a proclamation of their custom not to give this man a morsel of bread to eat, until he dropped dead upon the earth, and they did so". Again in 19:41 a woman is tried before the judges in the city of Admah for giving a poor man a drink of water.

SUMMARY

The narratives of Cain, Babel, Abraham and Lot just reviewed contain a city motif which has often been seen as the ancient author's symbol of the corruption that the advance of civilization necessarily carries with it. However in the analysis presented in this chapter attention has been given to the J writer as a sage, a man who accepted the validity of experience and knew that by reflecting on experience one would gain insight. The Yahwist was a man informed by his faith in Yahweh, made known through his dealings with Israel in history. In creating the great literary corpus, J utilized all literary and oral material in a unique and distinctive manner. With respect to the narratives in this chapter it has been shown that if there was an anti-urban intent in the original tradition the Yahwist has reworked it to comply with the larger theme of curses and blessings.

Although the unity of 4:1-26 is due entirely to the hand of the redactor the place of the city in the swing verse 17 is highly significant. The city, the cultural crown in non-Israelite literature and society; gets its origin in Israelite lore from a fratricidal fugitive or his son. The arts of civilization, products of urban descendents are wonderful but empty and destructive aside from Yahweh. Even temple building can become an act of arrogance if the spirit of Yahweh does not quicken the hearts of those who conceive and erect it. The pride and conceit of urban life reaches unnatural depravity. Hence, no one righteous may be found within the five cities of the plain of Jericho to save them from annihilation.

XUM

In chapter four the contemporary scene of the Yahwist author will be explored to see what events may have been the more proximate points for reflection. The Deuteronomist historian will view the acts of the monarchs and find them damnable by and large. The monarchy will be measured by the law, the statutes and the covenant of Moses as understood by the Deuteronomist historian as having been normative for every Israelite regardless of station. On the other hand, J will reflect on these events as to their value in a.) demonstrating how Yahweh acts through history, in particular through the leaders of Israel, and b.) illustrating in what manner men have responded to the initiatives of Yahweh. Israel has been given a sacred trust. How does the present course of events signify that she is keeping this trust or abusing it?

CHAPTER FOUR

A CRITIQUE OF THE CITY IN THE YAHWIST CORPUS

A. THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE ARK IN JERUSALEM

On the political level, David brought the old symbol of the tribal federation's unity to Jerusalem and thereby transferred its unifying force not only to himself and his successors but also to his personal city.[1] On the religious level, the ark was the symbol of the presence of Yahweh; it was also the symbol of Yahweh's covenant with Israel. By placing it in Jerusalem David intended that the ark would lend sanctity to his new capital and establish it as "a legitimate cultic place for Israel".[2] One may recall that Sargon of Akkad and his successors solidified their newly won political supremacy by incorporating conquered Sumerian deities. The Jebusite deity, אל עליון, was a title appropriated for Yahweh by the Israelites (Pss. 47:3; 18:14; 97:9).[3]

David combines his political center of Jerusalem, a city-fortress, with the religious sanctuary of tribal federation days in one bold stroke. His action brings about the co-existence in Jerusalem of the Jebusite priest,

---

1 J. W. Flanagan, A Study of the Biblical Traditions Pertaining to the Foundation of the Monarchy in Israel, an unpublished doctoral dissertation, Notre Dame, 1970, p. 127.

2 Von Rad, Hexateuch, p. 177. H. W. Hertzberg in substance is in agreement with Von Rad, I & II Samuel (Philadelphia, 1964), p. 63. Cf. also M. Noth, "Jerusalem und die israelitische Tradition," Gesammelte Studien zum Alten Testament (Munich, 1960), p. 172; O. Eissfeldt, "Silo und Jerusalem," SVT 4(1957), pp. 141-142.

3 Cf. DeVaux, Ancient Israel, pp. 294, 310, and 374. Cf. also supra pp. 46-48, 111-112.

Zadok, and his own Yahwistic priest, Abiathar of the house of Eli.[4] Rowley's proposal that Zadok was a Jebusite priest whom David confirmed as chief of the Jerusalem shrine still bears the weight of probability.[5] Abiathar, David's companion during his days of outlawtry and sole survivor of Saul's massacre of the priests at Nob, was also given charge of custody of the Ark. The literature does not indicate clearly how the separate religious traditions of Zadok and Abiathar were to merge. According to the report in I Kgs. 2:26-27, the Zadok-Nathan party succeeds in ousting Abiathar as Solomon banishes him to his ancestral home in Anathoth. Abiathar's crime was that he had joined Adonijah's festival-party celebrating the latter's self-appointment to the throne as David lay dying.

Rowley is of a mind that concomitant with David's consolidation of political and religious power in Jerusalem was his permission to continue

---

4 R. E. Clements, God and Temple, (Philadelphia, 1965), pp. 41-42; H. J. Kraus, Worship in Israel, trans. by Geoffrey Buswell, (Richmond, 1966), pp. 201-208. A quite different view has been advanced by Frank M. Cross in Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic, (Cambridge, Mass., 1973), pp. 207-213, suggesting an Aaronid origin for Zadok.

5 H. H. Rowley, "Zadok and Nehushtan," JBL 58(1939), pp. 113-141. Also, Rowley, "Melchizedek and Zadok (Gen. 14 and Ps. 110)," Zeitschrift für Alfred Bertholet, (Tübingen, 1950), pp. 461-472. Briefly, Rowley's suggestion is this: 1) Zadok does not appear in the literature prior to David's capture of Jerusalem, 2) the names of the pre-Israelite kings and priests of Jerusalem also contain the root צדק and thus argue for a Jebusite origin for Zadok, 3) Gen. 14 is an aetiological story legitimating the Jebusite priesthood at Jerusalem, and Ps. 110 celebrates the enthronement of David as king and priest thus supporting the legitimacy of the Jebusite priestly line. The more recent conjectures of C. E. Hauer, "Who was Zadok?" JBL 82(1963), pp. 89-94, associating Zadok with David at Hebron through I Chr. 12:29 must be viewed with reserve. Cf. also DeVaux, Ancient Israel, pp. 372-374.

XUM

the cult of Nehushtan, the former Jebusite cult symbol. Therefore, the Jebusite temple of Zadok housed the Ark, the Yahwistic cult object, side by side with the Brazen Serpent. Legitimation for such a cult may be found in Nbs. 21:5-9 wherein it is Moses who casts the bronze serpent to cure snake bites near Edom. It may be proposed that the religious horizon of J contained the continued tension of the two officially recognized cults fostered by David in Jerusalem.[6] II Kgs. 18:4 may hold the resolution of the problem of the never fully accepted practice on the part of the more traditional Yahwistic believers.

The narrative of the Ark leads from Shiloh to the shrine at Jerusalem. The Court History narrates Yahweh's establishment of the Davidic dynasty at Jerusalem. Jerusalem then becomes the urban focal point of the Yahwist for it is in Jerusalem that Israel's age-old struggle with religious syncretism continues.

B. GIBEON AND HEBRON

The difficulties arising from the use of I Sam. as an historical source concerning Saul are formidable. Nevertheless good argument may be made as to the highly sensitive relation Saul had with what may very well have been his residence city, viz., Gibeon.[7] There can be little doubt that Gibeon was an

---

6 Rowley has connected the Nehushtan cult with native Canaanite fertility practices which in turn suggests a correlation between the serpent figure of Gen. 3 and the Jebusite cult symbol. Cf. also, J. Chaine, Genesis, (Paris, 1951), pp. 49-50.

7 J. Blenkinsopp, "Did Saul Make Gibeon his Capital?" VT 24(1974) pp. 1-7; idem, Gibeon and Israel, (Cambridge, 1972).

XUM

important urban center of Hivvite background strategically central to Saul's kingdom.[8] The city retained its religious importance into the reign of Solomon as the great high place (I Kgs. 3:4). The political significance of Gibeon may be reckoned in Saul's erecting there the first altar to Yahweh (I Sam. 14:33).

The traditions of Saul are such a diary of failure that one must suspect the narratives as exhibiting no small bias against him. Alienating the Gibeonites who had by treaty become covenanted with Israel was but one of his blunders. Saul's residence at Gibeah, his birthplace, as attested in I Sam. 10:26 may be questioned in view of the polemical edge of the narrator or at least as a poor alternative to governing from Gibeon as depicted in Jos. 10:2.[9]

Jerusalem gains such importance during the reigns of David and Solomon that Gibeon is eclipsed in the literature. Its exclusion is more likely to be the result of an anti-Saul editing of the traditions rather than an anti-city motive.

By contrast the city of Hebron is prominent in the rise of David: the elders of Israel confer kingship on him (II Sam. 4:1-5). Hebron may have been a vassalage of the Philistines at the time; later, Absalom initiates his revolt from Hebron; the patriarchs, Abraham and Jacob are associated with Hebron in the J narratives. Yet whatever primacy it enjoyed prior to the establishment of the dynasty of David at Jerusalem faded after David began to

---

[8] Excavations by J. B. Pritchard have revealed that Gibeon was a center of a large wine producing industry and having a reasonably higher population density than Jerusalem before David. Cf. Gibeon: Where the Sun Stood Still, (Princeton, 1962), pp. 79-99.

[9] Blenkinsopp, VT, 24(1974), p. 4.

rule from the Jebusite city.

The literature of the period offers no rival to Jerusalem during the time of the united monarchy comparable in political and social status; there were cultic rivals but these were subordinated by the policies of David and Solomon in making Jerusalem the religious center of the kingdom. In the discussion above concerning the social, political, and economic conditions in Canaan during the second millenium there were sufficient reasons present which might spawn an anti-city sentiment among the non-urban populace.[10] However, the J author does not wield the stylus to champion the oppressed peasant revolting against his urban overlords. His own social context may have precluded this. The Yahwist himself is the epitome of that elite urban group, the royal scribal circle. The more proximate sources of the Yahwist's urban attitude will be found in the environment of Davidic-Solomonic Jerusalem.

C. JERUSALEM UNDER DAVID

During the thirty-three year reign of David at Jerusalem he transformed it from a hilltop fortress of the Jebusites into the royal city of his kingdom. David burst the old tribal federation pattern irrevocably. He arises as a vassal of the Philistines, complete with feudal retainers and hereditary fief (I Sam. 27:6). Jerusalem becomes his personal fief through force of arms; as king, he maintained a mercenary guard and established an

---

10 Cf. above pp. 88-102. One is reminded of the later Rechabites in this context. There is no evidence that they existed as a group prior to their mention in II Kgs. 10.

hereditary monarchy. His political acumen in gaining the support of diverse political groups enabled him to consolidate the various ethnic, religious, and social groups extant in Canaan.[11] There was a radical pluralism in his kingdom and capital city which disarms any attempt to revert to the "good old days" in any sphere of national life.

It is difficult to assess the lines of continuity between David and the older tribal order in Israel. The scribal efforts to assure the legitimacy of David were prodigious. However compatible with tradition David becomes in the narratives, his capacity to innovate is not obscured. The Davidic traditions record widely divergent sketches of David: he is the youngest son of a shepherd (I Sam. 16:6-13), or a Wunderkind (I Sam. 17:6-9), a ruthless politico in II Sam. 11, or the efficient planner and leader cresting the problems of governance; a man of deep faith in II Sam. 15:25-26, or one not bound by traditional religious propriety in II Sam. 6:12-19. David's cosmopolitan approach to life leads away from Saul's posture of a man bewildered by his call in life and at the mercy of events in his history. David is a man who fully appreciates his role of responsibility for his acts vis-à-vis Yahweh.— His wisdom was the wisdom to discern the will of Yahweh. He listened to counsel (II Sam. 14:1-20) because he could see in the advice Yahweh communicating his will.[12] He was free enough to break with tradition (I Sam.

---

11 The Philistine suspicions which disallowed David's participation in the Gilboa action should be viewed in the same light as his refraining from slaying Saul at Hachilah (I Sam. 26:1-25), namely, that the narrator did not wish to implicate David in anything contributing to the death of the annointed Saul.

12 Flanagan, Foundations, p. 119.

21:1-6) and responsible enough to own his guilt when wrong (II Sam. 12: 16-23).

The military personnel with which David surrounded himself consisted of men of lower social status, the disenfranchised and restless (I Sam. 22: 1-2).[13] Rib-Addi speaks of the SA.GAZ of Abdi-Asirta in similar terms. Their only intent was political sedition.[14] Many of Saul's fighting men went over to David after Gilboa indicating that their profession may have been that of the mercenary. The ancient Canaanite practice of granting land in return for military service was known to Saul (I Sam. 22:7) and apparently may be supposed of David as well. Alt describes the incorporation of the numerous small mountain states by David as the result of an administrative need to provide fiefs for his heroes outside the territory of Israel-Judah.[15] Two aspects of the military cadre are of note: 1) the practice of maintaining a personal mercenary force is an old Canaanite royal institution alien to the tribal federation's means of raising troops and conducting warfare; 2) a change in the covenantal land tenure system took place.[16]

The study of the administrative offices of the monarchy suggests to

---

13 B. Mazar, "The Military Elite of King David," VT 13(1963), pp. 310-320.

14 Cf. EA, 104, 116, 117.

15 Cf. above pp. 80-82. Alt, "The Formation of the Israelite State in Palestine," Essays, pp. 293-294. Cf. Also, Gray, ZAW 64(1952), p. 52.

16 Henrey, PEQ 86(1954), pp. 6, 10-11; Bellefontaine, Covenant Stipulations, pp. 191-192.

XUM

DeVaux that there was "some influence of Egyptian institutions, but it does not enable us to decide whether this influence was direct, or whether it came indirectly to Israel from the Canaanite states which Israel displaced".[17] Jehoshapat the מזכיר during the reigns of David and Solomon is best understood in the sense of the Egyptian office of "whm.w, viz., he who repeats, calls, announces," and not as many have interpreted it to be, a scribal position.[18] Jehoshapat's office was more that of a press secretary than that of a desk secretary.[19]

The Canaanite city-state could not offer a complete blueprint for all the offices, especially that of the scribal office. Social class stratification similar to the ancient feudal order reappears under the monarchy.[20] Cultic compromises may be at the base of Ex. 34:11-16.[21] Even though it was David who set in motion many of these innovations (several in opposition to the covenant of tribal days), it is to the same David that Yahweh makes the unparalled commitment of his hesed in II Sam. 7:15-16.

---

[17] R. DeVaux, Ancient Israel, p. 129, Cf. also idem, "Titres et Fonctionnaires égyptiens à la cour de David et de Salomon," RB 48(1939), pp. 394-405.

[18] DeVaux, Ancient Israel, p. 132.

[19] J. Begrich, "Sofer und Mazkir," ZAW 58(1940), pp. 1-29. Cf. H. G. Reventlow, "Das Amt des Mazkir," Theologische Zeitschrift 15 (1959), pp. 161-175; also H. J. Boecker, "Erwägungen zum Amt des Mazkir," ThZ 17(1961), pp. 212-216.

[20] H. W. Wolff, "Masters and Slaves: On Overcoming Class-Struggle in the Old Testament," Interpretation 27(1973), pp. 259-272. Also, I. Mendelsohn, "Authority and Law in Canaan-Israel," JAOS Supplement, 17(1954), pp. 25-33, also, BASOR 85(1942), pp. 14-17, BASOR, 167(1962), pp. 31-35.

[21] These verses have been reworked by a later hand according to Noth but their basis is undoubtedly J.

XUM

The oracle of II Sam. 7 proclaims that Yahweh has not only pledged himself to remain with the house of David "forever" but has changed David from a mere shepherd to a prince, made him victorious over superior forces, made his name great, given his people a place among the nations (contrast the fate of Babel), insured him heirs and a kingdom. Social, political and religious changes are thus given theological respectability. There are numerous texts in the J corpus which indirectly mirror a similar enthusiasm (Gen. 49:8-12, Nbs. 24:17-19 are but two). This is not to say that the Yahwist can be described with absolute certainty as receptive to all the tensions the monarchy created.[22]

D. JERUSALEM UNDER SOLOMON

The old social and economic system of the tribal days underwent radical revision.[23] First, the religious value system of the tribal covenant whereby members were equal under their overlord Yahweh became politicized under Solomon by the division into administrative districts; social control supplants ethical control.[24] The Yahwistic faith which had been the basis of the tribal federation, particular to a people, had now become a state religion definable in terms of territory.[25] Secondly, covenantal law had given way

---

22 G. Von Rad, Old Testament Theology, Vol. 1, (New York, 1962), p. 40.

23 Mendenhall believes that with Solomon there is a total return to the political organization of the pre-David Jebusite regime. Cf. Generation, p. 176. n. 8.

24 Cf. supra p. 114.

25 Ibid., p. 48.

to the divine right of the king; he was the sole authority and the prophetic voice quieted.[26] Thirdly, the absolutism of Ex. 34:14 "for you shall worship no other god, for the Lord, whose name is Jealous, is a jealous God,"[27] is replaced by the expediency of idolatry (I Kgs. 11:4-5). Fourthly, Solomon builds a temple to house Yahweh, a project David was advised not to attempt by Nathan (II Sam. 7:5-7).[28] Trends set in motion or made possible by David's innovation reached an intolerable extreme under Solomon. The Yahwism of pre-monarchic Israel and of David was bastardized by the singularly qualified Solomon.

David had placed Israel on the international scene through warfare (a summary of his conquests is found in II Sam. 8:1-8); Solomon, on the other hand

---

26 Samuel advises Saul, Gad and Nathan direct David, and Ahijah counsels Jereboam but no prophet instructs Solomon for he received his wisdom from on high.

27 The source analysis of this verse is not definitive. Noth believes that 14b-17 is written in a deuteronomic style but have a J base; 14a is J; 14 parallels 20:3 from E but he concedes that 20:1-17 has more than one source. Cf. M. Noth, Exodus, (Philadelphia, 1962), pp. 260-263.

28 The point made in ch. 2 while discussing the temple function in Mesopotamia should be recalled, viz., that the political leader appropriates greater power to insure unity by reordering the pantheon according to political rather than religious dictates. Cf. above, pp. 46-47. Cf. also, Mendenhall, Generation, p. 191.

placed Israel on the international market through trade. He industrialized the country, developed the cities and replaced the old rural economy with an updated urban system. He built or rebuilt fortress cities to guard trade routes.[29] He also constructed shipyards at Joppa, Dor and Ezion-geber. He instituted the manufacture of textiles and dyes at Ashkelon, Ashdod, Joppa, and Debir; and of perfume at Jericho and En-gedi. He established kilns and metalworking near Succoth and Zarethan. During his reign, heavy industry and copper mining in the Arabah began to thrive, buildings in stone on a large scale were erected, and more efficient water sources were developed for urban centers.[30] He streamlined the military to a chariot-based fighting force requiring less manpower but greater technology; he established chariot cities such as Megiddo and Gezer, and no doubt kept a stable in Jerusalem within the palace for parade purposes.[31] He secured friendly relations with other states by means of his many political marriages.[32]

---

29 Hazor, Megiddo and Gezer guarded the north-south routes to the west of the central highlands; Jerusalem through the highlands, with Arad at the south end and Tamar in the Arabah looking south to Ezion-geber. Store houses have been discovered in Debir, Bethshemesh, lower Beth-horon and Baalath. Cf. Y. Aharoni, The Land of the Bible, (London, 1968), pp. 273-280.

30 Cf. E. Neufeld, "Royal-Urban Society in Ancient Israel," HUCA 31(1960) pp. 31-53. Also, S. Yeivin, "Social, Religious and Cultural Trends in Jerusalem under the Davidic Dynasty," VT 3(1953), pp. 149-166.

31 Noth, History of Israel, pp. 209-210.

32 The total number of wives given in I Kgs. 11:3 must be regarded as inflated, however I Kgs. 3:1 may serve as an indication of his actual policy. The political marriages of Solomon typify the old pagan custom of using marital alliances to gain political ends. Ex. 34:12-16 warns against such arrangements as does Dt. 7:1-5. Intertribal marriages were not forbidden, in fact, a wider range may have been made possible through the covenant rather than prior to it. Cf. Mendenhall, Generation, p. 153.

The material progress resulting from Solomon's mercantile enterprises may in a degree be measured by the size and wealth of his urban centers. David had centered the political apparatus in his personal city, Jerusalem. Solomon expanded and enhanced Jerusalem to make it a brilliant setting for his jewel, the royal household.[33] The efficient administration of his urban network demanded a specialized staff dependent on the crown.[34] His numerous urban projects required money and manpower. Solomon got them in the fashion normal to Oriental kings: taxes and forced labor.[35] Israelites as well as non-Israelites were included in the corvée according to district (1 Kgs. 4:7).[36] Mettinger notes that the northern territory of Israel was particularly hard hit under Solomon's system of fiscal districts to provide the major share of men and money while Judah was held exempt.[37]

---

33 Noth, History of Israel, pp. 204-216. Cf. also K. Kenyon, Royal Cities of the Old Testament (New York, 1971), pp. 36-52.

34 A recent exhaustive study has been carried out by Tryggve N.D. Mettinger in Solomonic State Officials: A Study of the Civil Government Officials of the Israelite Monarchy, Coniectanea Biblica, Old Testament Series 5, (Lund, 1971). Hereafter cited as: Mettinger, State Officials.

35 Cf. A. F. Rainey, "Compulsory Labor Gangs in Ancient Israel," IEJ 20 (1070), pp. 191-202. There can be little doubt that David's census had as one of its goals the recruitment of slave labor.

36 I. Mendelsohn describes corvée in a manner befitting the social picture of second millenlial Canaan: "the obligation of the citizens to perform certain tasks, especially the construction of roads, erection of fortresses, building of temples, and the tilling of crown lands." BASOR 167(1962), pp. 31-35. This was the normal work of the Egyptian peasant. Yet, the Israelites rebel against it as if it were oppression in Ex. 1:11. Cf. J. L. McKenzie, A Theology of the Old Testament (Garden City, N.Y., 1974), p. 238.

37 Mettinger, State Officials, p. 158.

The crowning glory of Solomon's reign was the construction of the temple in Jerusalem. The impact of the temple upon Israelite life and subsequent history can only be compared to the establishment of the monarchy. It not only served, in time, to centralize the cult but also meant that religion would now serve the state, binding the people to the king rather than to one another as formerly under the covenant. The temple ritual would maintain the solidarity of the authority structure and act as the approved medium through which the people might reach Yahweh. Thus it had the effect of placing Yahweh at the disposal of the people's representative on the one hand, and on the other of securing their loyalty by religious sanction and not brute force. The mutual support between Yahweh and the king, in this novel and uncovenantal arrangement, would reinforce royal policies affecting every area of Israelite life. Such demands would not go unresented but for the time would lack an effective counteraction.[38] Under Solomon religion became an agent of social control as it had been in "all the other nations".

There is no direct evidence that Solomon's temple operated in precisely the same manner as the temple in Mesopotamia. By analogy one may infer that it quickly became a "civic, cultural and economic center".[39] The temple would have its own treasury, perhaps the same as the royal palace, which

---

38 I. Mendelsohn is of the opinion that Samuel's opposition to the monarchy in I Sam. 8:4-17 seen in the light of documents from Alalakh and Ugarit is an "Authentic description of the semi-feudal Canaanite society" during the time of Samuel. The first Israelite king to fulfill the descriptions 8:11b-17a is Solomon. "Samuel's Denunciation of Kingship in the Light of the Akkadian Documents," BASOR 143(1956), pp. 17-22.

39 McKenzie, DB, p. 872. See also, supra, pp. 45-46. Idem, A Theology of the Old Testament, p. 58 notes that the temple was considerably smaller than

received the taxes and tributes of the populace. Gold and silver, slaves and animals were given to the temple from the booty (Nbs. 31:25-31); David while at Ziklag had distributed booty among the people (I Sam. 30:16-30; II Sam. 8:11 is part of the deuteronomic summary). Neufeld is certain that the temple wealth of the priests would be reason enough to conclude that temple loans at interest were a service from the days of Solomon.[40] The Mesopotamian temple subsidized banking and trading, managed real estate and large staffs of specialists including artisans, musicians and courtesans (see above p. 42); it would not be far afield to assert that Solomon's temple would have engaged in such pursuits. The Jerusalem temple not only harbored cults, foreign and offensive to Yahwism, but also became an agent of slavery, exploitation of the poor, forced labor and taxation.[41] Forced labor and taxation are justified in I Kgs. 5: 13-18 in the name of temple-building; the wisdom theme intrudes in I Kgs. 3:5 to make Solomon's dream issue in his request for wisdom and is continued in the story of the two harlots, whereas the announcement to build a temple would originally have followed his dream on the high place, Gibeon.[42] Thus the temple would

---

39 (cont'd)
the palace to which it was attached.

40 E. Neufeld, "The Prohibitions against Loans at Interest," HUCA 26(1955), pp. 376-382.

41 Neufeld, HUCA 31(1960), p. 40. Cf. above, p. 41.

42 Kapelrud, Orientalia 32(1963), pp. 59-61. His point that temple building by kings is always derived from a divine source so as to legitimate the increased financial burden on the populace is well illustrated in Solomon. Religion has become yet another tool for enhancing the crown's monopoly of force.

appear odious to those who still believed the prophecy given to Nathan in II Sam. 7. Only in vs. 13 is the hint given that a temple may be built.

The city absorbed increasing numbers of people migrating from the rural area, who had become displaced by war, debt, or the promise of a livelihood in the city. These men had to learn a trade or hire themselves out as laborers, or worse, be conscripted for the corvée. II Sam. 9:10 indicates that wealthy city patrons owned rural land and employed tenant farmers to till it. The absentee landlords lived in the city in luxury while the peasant had to be content to work fields not his own at a subsistence level.[43] The crown had become the great landowner disposing of entire cities as pieces of royal property (I Kgs. 9:10), quite contrary to the covenant concept that Yahweh was the great overlord of all Israelites, his tenants.

Beginning with David but brought to full term only by the direction of the policies of Solomon, the city of Jerusalem took on the character of a Canaanite city-state, replete with temple, social classes, and economic disparity. From the systematic rejection of many cultural traits of the Late Bronze Age urban and imperial cultures, such as, kingship, military elite, and temple, in favor of a people ethically and religiously bound by covenant to Yahweh alone, Israel had now become what she had rejected. Religion now functioned as the guarantor of political legitimacy the seat of which was the city of Jerusalem. The same intolerable social conditions that underlay the overthrow of the Canaanite cities in the formative period had returned to blossom anew under Solomon.

---

[43] Cf. above, p. 93.

E. SCRIBAL ACTIVITY AT JERUSALEM

The peace and prosperity that Solomon's long reign brought allowed for the development of a royal bureaucracy always in need of well-trained civil servants. Mettinger has observed that the existence of an Israelite scribal school is supported

> by the observation that Israelite wisdom literature is strongly influenced by the Egyptian forms and concepts. And these forms and concepts were fostered within the context of the Egyptian school where they served to educate officials.[44]

It has been stated above that the Yahwist corpus most probably originated in such a court school during the time of David and Solomon.[45] It remains to understand the place of wisdom in the school and the school's function in the kingdom.

The school not only trained clerks to record inventories and census but also diplomats, wealthy patrons' children, practitioners of the fine arts, and "friends of the king". It is the position of this study that the function of wisdom in the J corpus is not the same as the function represented by the guild of wise men responsible for I Kgs. 3:4-15; 16-28; 5:9-14; 10:1-13; these men were sympathetic to Solomon, and anxious to incorporate him into their circle so as to increase the social authority of the guild.[46] The material

---

44 Mettinger, State Officials, p. 145.

45 Cf. above, pp. 197-198. Also, McKenzie, A Theology of the Old Testament, pp. 137-138.

46 J. Liver, "The Book of the Acts of Solomon," Biblica 48(1967), pp. 75-101.

success of Solomon led to his inclusion in the wise man's circle, a circle which had little relation to the Yahwistic tradition embodied in J. For example, Solomon's charism of wisdom, received at Gibeon, revived the old non-Israelite tradition of a god as the source of wisdom.[47] The ritual is superseded by the dream through which Solomon becomes the repository of wisdom and therefore the ultimate authority on the knowledge of good and evil.

The Court History is a product of the wise men of David's court. They perceived that David survived the turbulence of his reign by exercising his wisdom to "discern what was Yahweh's will".[48] There is no such attribution as the spring of Solomon's wisdom. Solomon knew 3,000 proverbs, 1,005 songs, discoursed on the trees, plants, animals and fish (I Kgs. 4: 29-34). His wisdom can be viewed in the house he built, the food he ate, the splendor of his ceremonies, the finery of his court attendants, his burnt offerings to the Lord (I Kgs. 10:3-5); the fruit of his wisdom was the adulation of men and their gifts of tribute. His wisdom did not transcend the fascination of technology nor did it ever seek to know the hearts of men.

---

47 M. Jastrow, The Religion of Babylonia and Assyria, (Boston, 1898), pp. 62-63. One may note the association of the ensi-apkallu tradition wherein the god's custodian, the king, was wise with the wisdom of his patron. Gilgamesh possesses the powers of Shamash; Enkidu, those of Enki, god of wisdom. Gilgamesh constructs Uruk with the help of the Seven Sages.

48 Flanagan, Foundations, p. 119.

David had respected his wise man's counsel because it "contained a power approximating God's own oracles".[49] Only Yahweh's own intervention might overrule it. But Solomon was his own counsellor, he spoke with the very power and wisdom that God personally conferred on him (I Kgs. 10:24).

Such a contrast in conceiving the nature of wisdom from one circle to the next is critical in understanding the function of wisdom at the court. It may be argued that each monarch had his sycophants and propagandists and that these may be found among the scribes of the court. However the affinity of thought between J and the Court History is far greater than that of J and the pro-Solomonic portions of I Kings.

It has been convincingly demonstrated that the literary stylistics of the Yahwist corpus and the Succession narrative have a great deal in common in motifs.[50] Secondly, one is led to the conclusion from a study of Gen. 2-4, 11:1-9, that the J author was well acquainted with the current cultural fund of wisdom.[51] Wolff has placed the Yahwist "in the vicinity of the Solomonic capital in times when, perhaps, the first crises of the empire were already appearing on the horizon".[52] Thirdly, several reasons point to a date of

---

49 Ibid.

50 J. Blenkinsopp, "Theme and Motif in the Succession History (2 Sam XI:2ff) and the Yahwist Corpus," SVT 15(1965), pp. 45-58.

51 J. L. McKenzie, "Primitive History: Form Criticism," Society of Biblical Literature: Seminar Papers Vol. 1, 1974, pp. 97-98.

52 Wolff, Interpretation 20(1966), p. 136.

composition of the J work during the reign of Solomon.[53] 1) Von Rad has noted that it was a period in which the idea that Israel had received a mission to rule the nations and act as their source of blessing was popular among Israelite intellectuals;[54] 2) the themes, motifs and stylistics in J are similar to I Sam. 16-31 and II Sam. 9-20-I Kgs. 1-2; 3) the foreshadowing texts relating the rise of the Davidic dynasty in Gen. 49:8-12, Nbs. 24: 7-9, 17-19 are more relevant during Solomon's reign than later; 4) Gen. 27:39-40 reflects a knowledge of II Sam. 8:12-14 and I Kgs. 11:14, namely, David's capture of Edom and its subsequent revolt, would indicate a terminus a quo during Solomon's tenure; 5) there is lacking any specific notice of a divided kingdom or animosity between Judah and Israel as Gen. 49 has Joseph and Judah blessed equally, perhaps indicating a terminus ad quem toward the end

---

53 Among the authors who feel confident in such a dating are: Weiser, Introduction, p. 102; Von Rad, Genesis, p. 16, 18; G. E. Wright, The God Who Acts, (London, 1952), p. 73, n. 1; B. W. Anderson, Understanding the Old Testament, (Englewood, Cliffs, N.J. 1966), p. 16; M. Noth, Pentateuch, pp. 44-45; E. Jacob, Théologie de l' ancien Testament, (Neuchâtel, 1955), p. 158; S. Mowinckel, Erwägungen zur Pentateuch Quellenfrage (Trondheim, 1964), p. 57.

54 Von Rad, Hexateuch, p. 70. K. Galling, Die Erwählungstradition Israels, (Giessen, 1928), p. 68.

of Solomon's reign; 6) history writing would be appropriate in a time in which Israel had reached her zenith of power.[55]

The scribal school at Jerusalem used proverbial wisdom to educate the young scribes and court aspirants. The indebtedness of Israelite proverbial teaching to Egyptian models has been established for a number of years.[56] Brueggemann sees this proverbial teaching as the source for the Succession narrative and the Yahwist's primeval history.[57]

However, a serious methodological problem arises regarding the manner in which one may say that proverbial wisdom influenced such works as the Succession narrative and J. Recently, Von Rad has taken the position that Israel's wise men intellectualized in a pattern quite different from that found in these two early writings.[58] He believed that the wise man's intellectual endeavor was pre-occupied with the discovery and evaluation of rules of life; they appealed to tradition and Yahweh for self-legitimation. They expressed themselves in a limited range of literary forms that provide the critic with a

---

55 Mettinger has taken the Joseph narrative as wisdom writing of didactic character whose setting was the "wisdom school at the court of Jerusalem in the Solomonic-post-Solomonic period," State Officials, p. 154.

56 R. B. Y. Scott, The Way of Wisdom, (New York, 1971), pp. 26-34; G. Von Rad, Wisdom in Israel, (New York, 1972), argues on p. 72 for the distinctiveness of Israelite wisdom vis-à-vis Egyptian. Cf. Mettinger, State Officials, pp. 140-157.

57 Brueggemann, In Man We Trust, p. 60.

58 Von Rad, Wisdom, p. 291, also p. 294, n. 9.

passe partout for discerning the work of the sage.[59] It must be admitted that if proof of relatedness is limited so illiberally the literary affinity between the wisdom corpus and the narratives of II Sam. 9-20-I Kgs. 1-2 and J vanish. However, such refinements are quite recent in origin and need not have been stipulations observed among the scribes themselves. Therefore it is the position of this writer that merely collecting and having maxims of life in a set form presents only a partial picture of the interests and range of the sage. That the wise man was concerned with experience but not history may be true in a cultural milieu such as Egypt but not Israel. If there is a sharply distinctive note between Israel and Egypt it is Israel's unique appreciation for the historical. The experience of Yahweh's intervention in history was a radical factor in the intellectual make-up of the Israelite sage. There must be granted a larger place for the literary creativity of J as a sage than the capsulizing of experience into mashals. Maxims and laws are but two ways of expressing an insight into a guide to better living.

The Yahwist writer displays a reason emancipated from mythological restraints throughout his work. He freely employs myths, genealogies, or divine soliloquies uncommon in conventional wisdom literature, factors which do not in se exclude him from the sage's vie intellectuelle. His confessional

---

59 A similar concern for stricter standards in speaking of a "wisdom influence" has been voiced by J. L. Crenshaw, "Method in Determining Wisdom Influence upon 'Historical' Literature," JBL 88 (1969), pp. 129-142. Crenshaw's zeal for clarity has severely cauterized some important studies of any wisdom character, viz., the Joseph narrative (Von Rad), the Succession narrative (Whybray), Esther and similar literature.

content interprets his history in a way meaningful for his contemporaries. And if one may agree with Alonso-Schökel, J is fond of reflecting on contemporary problems in an etiological fashion.[60] The Yahwist is a sage in the sense that he reflects on the validity of experience of men to discern the will and intent of Yahweh.[61] He sees this in history: tribal and folk, political and religious.

F. MESOPOTAMIAN, EGYPTIAN AND CANAANITE INFLUENCE

The survey of Mesopotamian literature in chapter two revealed no texts that could be classified as anti-urban. The reason stated was that the basic form of the civilization was the city and everything including politics and religion were seen from the urban point of view. There was room for some things which might be called extra-urban but not anti-urban.

The possible exception to this was the figure of Enkidu in the Gilgamesh epic. However, analysis of the mythological associations behind Enkidu and Gilgamesh pointed toward a conclusion that each was a god of fertility, the former of animal fertility, the latter of vegetation. The story relates the failure of the gods to solve the enigma of immortality, something reserved for mortals, Utnapishtim and his wife only as a gift of his patron Enki-Ea, the god of wisdom. The joining of the once independent Enkidu narrative to

---

60 Alonso-Schökel, Biblica 43(1962), pp. 295-296.

61 Flanagan, Foundations, p. 119 wherein this is said to be the insight of the author of the Court History.

the Gilgamesh cycle reveals a contrast between a rural scenario in which man is simply an animal among others, and urban life in which he can realize his full potential as man.

Egyptian literature professes no interest in the city other than the setting of the royal residence.[62] This lack of concern should be kept in mind when one recalls the Egyptian influence on the court life during the reigns of David and Solomon. There is no anti-urban literary precedent forthcoming from Egypt.

In the literature from the urban centers of Ugarit, Mari, Nuzi, and Alalakh during the Bronze Age one finds a social structure that is feudal in character and city-state in form. The material gathered from the excavations of the archives reflects the viewpoint of the urban dweller. Likewise many of the Amarna tablets reflect the political machinations of dissidents as reported by the urbanite Rib-Addi. Thus the survey in chapter two of the ebb and flow of urbanization and de-urbanization under the continuing form of the city-state, found a growing hiatus between the urban elite and rural peasant as the cause of the breakdown of the feudal order. Social conditions were favorable to the rise of anti-urban traditions, however, the pre-Israelite literature does not furnish any examples of an anti-urban attitude. Writing is the skill of the scribe, a city dweller by the nature of his profession.[63]

---

62 Cf. above, pp. 65-66.

63 Cf. above, p. 24. Were the compilers of the oracles of Amos or Micah city-dwellers or rural scribes? Very little is known about the manner in which the oracles became written. Until better evidence is forthcoming it would seem more prudent to believe that within their circle of disciples, a scribe of the city or one trained to write but living outside the city and sympathetic to the prophetic message, was responsible.

G. CONCLUSIONS FROM THE YAHWIST CORPUS[64]

The Amarna literature detailed the disintegration of the urban-feudal system. Reurbanization takes place once again under the united monarchy, notably during the reign of Solomon. Concurrent with this historical phenomenon is the appearance of Israelite historiography in the narratives of the Ark and Court History.[65] The urban renascence is the setting for the composition of the Yahwist corpus; the full effects of urbanization had begun to be felt

---

64 It must be acknowledged that not every text in which עיר occurs in the J corpus has been treated in chapter three. The word עיר is found 35 times in the J portions of Genesis of which 19 occurrences are located in the texts surveyed; 9 are scattered references of a miscellaneous character, 7 occur in the story of Shechem, Gen. 34. The Yahwist has included in this narrative a story of composite origins undoubtedly of northern provenance. It relates the tale of the attempted treaty between the ruling urban class of Shechemites under Hamor the Hivvite with a non-urban group led by Jacob. It is difficult to assay the purpose of the narrative in terms of its position within the city tradition. Neither group appears guileless as they contract the treaty. Simeon and Levi are left landless for their treachery, the men of Shechem are slaughtered while in their delicate condition, and only Jacob seems to keep a semblance of honor but even his motives are less than edifying. If the narrative was originally told to portray the superior wisdom of the Hebrew pastoral group over the urbanites this motive has been superseded by tribal considerations. There is a violation of a treaty and subsequent estrangement here much the same as Saul's violation of the Gibeonite treaty (cf. J. Blenkinsopp, Gibeon and Israel, (Cambridge, 1972), pp. 37-38.). The demise of the Leah tribes, Simeon and Levi (Gen. 34), and Reuben (Gen. 35:22a) are a prominent consideration in these chapters. Exodus has but 3 occurrences and Numbers only 6 of עיר . The selections studied in chapter 3 provide the better texts for analysis.

65 G. Von Rad, "The Beginnings of Historical Writing in Ancient Israel," Hexateuch, pp. 166-204.

but had not had time to trigger an outright rejection of urban civilization. As yet the deleterious effects could be attributed to the excesses of a single monarch rather than monarchy, to political strategems inimical to religious traditions rather than the rise of a social institution which later prophets came to identify more precisely. The anti-urbanism in the J corpus - and the phrase must be employed cautiously - is only incipient; it cannot be separated from the revulsion of the Yahwist for Solomonic policy.

It must be recalled that Yahwism was not originally urban. The major themes of the Pentateuchal traditions as analyzed by Noth relate the encounters of a family and then a people with their god Yahweh and their search for a permanent abode. The overwhelming weight of these traditions on the side of a rural ambient for earlier stages of Yahwism cannot be put aside. The Joshua covenant of Jos. 24 indicates that native Canaanite groups came to be members of the religious federation through covenanting. Even though large numbers of Canaanites may have joined the Yahwistic religion whose story of "guidance - from Egypt" would supply historical precedent for their own aspirations for political freedom and whose social tenet of equality would be attractive, the fact remains that Yahwism was born outside the Canaanite city-state system. The Yahwist reveals the strains that the royal policy of urbanizing tribal Yahwism was affecting.

The series of stories in Gen. 2-11 inculcate a fierce opposition to any form of the Canaanite fertility cults and reassert the truth that Yahweh and not Baal is the Lord of life. There is also the pattern that sin will be followed by punishment; a punishment perhaps still visible to his audience. In Gen. 12-50

the Yahwist dwells on the fruits of fidelty to Yahweh in Gen. 27:27-28; 49:10-12; 22-25; 30:33-43. In themselves these texts could be dealing with a syncretism that Yahwism was fighting since the moment it entered Canaan. However, in view of the specific programs of Solomon they take on a more urgent cast.

Von Rad correctly assumes that the decisive factor in bringing the Yahwist saga into creation was the great feats of David.[66] His "nationalism" is related to the fact that in David the fulfillment of Yahweh's promises (that his people would possess their own land and be numerous) had come to pass. He undertakes the composition of the corpus to make clear Yahweh's hidden activity in history so that his contemporaries and posterity might really know why Israel was what she was. If one reads the promises (Gen. 12:1-3; 49: 8-12; Nbs. 24:17-19), the genealogies that follow the younger son over the elder (note the foreshadowing texts of Gen. 25:23; 27:29, 40 regarding Edom) they point to the Davidic dynasty. David himself is never mentioned explicitly in any text of J, although few critics doubt J's enthusiasm for David. On the other hand some have concluded that since there is no explicit denunciation of Solomon in J that he had nothing to say concerning the same.[67] It

---

66 Von Rad, "The Form Critical Problem of the Hexateuch," Hexateuch, pp. 71-73.

67 P. Ellis, Men and Message of the Old Testament, (Collegeville, Minn., 1963), p. 317. Ellis writes: "He (Yahwist) probably believed that the dynasty would produce a succession of ideal kings, whose fidelity to the spirit and stipulations of the Sinai covenant would win for Israel and the world a return to paradisaical holiness and bliss." Ellis places the writing of J around 950 B.C. well into the reign of Solomon; apparently the work was finalized in this same year and left untouched by other members of the tradition.

XUM

is the position of the present writer that the Yahwist had indeed great admiration and devotion for David and his dynasty, but was also quite capable of discerning the excesses and abuses of his successor, Solomon. If the stories in the primeval history posit one truth it may very well be that every man is accountable for what he does. Good men are rewarded; evil, punished. The results are known in the experience of men and no further proof is needed.

Therefore the historical events that established David on the throne could fire the Yahwist's writing of the primeval, patriarchal and national histories. David's ability to retain control through the turbulent events of his reign because he relied on Yahweh would buttress the Yahwist's confidence that through a very human but wise king Yahweh could continue his plan of blessings for Israel and the other nations. However, the policies of Solomon and the historic events of his reign would also alert the Yahwist as to the direction Israel might go if she persisted in these follies.

The selections in chapter 3 reveal the Yahwist as a sage grappling with the real dangers that Solomonic policies were creating for Israel. The function of the true sage was to give genuine wise counsel not to provide sycophancy. In reading the stories of the primeval history as commentaries on contemporary events rather than prehistoric times, one may discern in them a didactic note which would be val id for any man but has particular application to the current monarch. Because of the nature of their presentation it cannot be stated with precision that the Yahwist wrote to reprimand Solomon himself. They aim rather at the mood embodied in the policies of Solomon, and the point is made persistently if unobtrusively: where does the path lead if away from Yahweh? Solo-

mon's mood was one which presumed upon the special relation of Israel to Yahweh. The temple theology seemed to take Yahweh for granted. Solomon in his typically non-Israelite symbol for the presence of Yahweh, viz., the temple, had secured Yahweh within the "king's chapel". It is the message to the throne that heed had better be given the warnings of the past: those who choose folly cannot avoid the consequences of folly.

The city in the Yahwist corpus is not an object of special reflection such as "land" or "wilderness". It does not form the urban pole of the rural-urban dichotomy. Most of the J corpus treats of events that occur in a pastoral setting this is to be expected in an account of events supposedly occuring prior to the establishment of the Israelites in Canaan. In those narratives examined, t he city is the stage on which the drama unfolds. It is a foolish fugitive who constructs the initial one; it is the hub around which the descendents of Cain seek a livelihood; it is the larger ring within which man's arrogance builds a Babel; and it is the fruit of evil men sharing a common fate at Sodom. The Yahwist has not depicted the city too kindly not because it was something which a people of nomadic ancestry would naturally abhor and suspect but because men made of it an occasion for infidelity to Yahweh. The city within which the greatest abuses were taking place in Solomon's day was in all probability Jerusalem.

The new social context that Yahwism had first given its adherents was replaced under the monarchy by a return to the social practices of pre-Yahwism. But it was only under the monarchy that Yahwism became politically established. Whereas originally Yahwism offered a break with the past now non-acceptance of it was paramount to political rebellion for it meant rejecting the religious

XUM

ethic of the new faith. Solomon's exploitation of Yahwism for greater power control was to prove self-defeating for the process was totally pagan and non- Yahwistic. The center of this activity was Jerusalem and the Yahwist was free to deplore it in universal terms confident that his audience would not fail to perceive his meaning.

The Yahwist does not issue a clear condemnation of the city. The prophetic criticism against the city as a social institution which was a portion of a corrupt system is present in embryo in the J corpus. The total corruption that successive reigns over the next few centuries would foster was not available to the Yahwist. Nor can it be said that the Yahwist opposed the city because it had become in the mind of the rulers (and people) a secure refuge apart from Yahweh.[68] Such formulations took a long period to gestate and find expression.[69]

In an effort to clarify as much as possible what the Yahwist attitude was toward the city certain elements drawn from the present study might be placed in order:

1) A pre-existing literary model for an anti-urban bias in J is lacking in the literature of Mesopotamia, Egypt and Canaan. However, the social conditions obtaining in Canaan for centuries prior to the formative period of

---

68 Frick, The City, p. 291.

69 More curious yet is the development of Judaism in post-exilic days into what Rivkin would term an urban religion, see E. Rivkin, "The Internal City: Judaism and Urbanization," Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion, 5(1966), pp. 225-240.

Yahwism were conducive towards the origin of such a tradition.

2) The social system that Yahwism opposed was specifically that of the Canaanite city-state.

3) Yahwism took root in Canaan during a period of deurbanization; it initiated a social change based upon its religious ethic.

4) The monarchy in Israel promoted the resurgence of the city while officially fostering religious syncretism in the capital city, Jerusalem.

5) The religious ideology of Yahwism was adjusted, if not reversed, by the new form of social organization, the monarchy. The monarchy reinstated the practices and vices of the once rejected Canaanite feudal system.

6) The Yahwist accepted David because he saw in him the fulfillment of ancient promises made by Yahweh. The Yahwist did adjust to the new social form of the monarchy by demonstrating its theological legitimacy.

7) Solomon abandoned any pretense of devotion to traditional Yahwism by building the Jerusalem temple and constructing shrines for the cult of the foreign gods and goddesses of his many wives.

8) Solomon also disregarded the covenantal freedom of the Israelite by conscripting him for compulsory labor.

9) The source of these drastic policies was the royal regime in the city of Jerusalem.

10) Therefore, the Yahwist uses city-traditions most probably originating in the pre-monarchic era to render current royal policies in an unfavorable light.

11) The Yahwist method of presenting these abuses is through recasting

XUM

ancient genealogies with selective notes on urban arts, realigning the genealogy with a new incipit; by retelling a Mesopotamian myth to indict an Israelite project; by including a nature legend to illustrate the consequences of a current perversion. In short, the Yahwist is a skilled narrator who prefers to make his point indirectly but insistently.

12) His critique of the city clearly includes the idea that man built the city and he alone is responsible for it. To erect a temple in it is no guarantee that Yahweh should save or protect the temple, city or men who made it.

This represents a major departure from the Mesopotamian concept that the city is the property of the god; he protects it if its citizens give him proper worship, he withdraws if not and a stronger god of another city becomes the city's patron through conquest.

The height of civilization that Israel achieved during the united monarchy was not ungodly and perverse <u>in se</u> but was always the occasion for man's pride in what Yahweh had done for those whom he had chosen to become man's arrogance in what he can do for himself. The pluralism of the kingdom and the city of Jerusalem was J's key to understanding that Israel did not exist for it's own pleasure but was to serve as a reference, a medium through which its blessings would be poured out on others.

It is the conclusion of this study that the city traditions in J provide an index to the cultural-religious abuses that existed during the reign of Solomon. The focal point was the city of Jerusalem and, in particular, the temple of Solomon. J's insistence on the basics that the land and its fertility were gifts of Yahweh to Abraham and his descendants, that the numerous peoples

XUM

that made up the nation were also a promise fulfilled would also serve as a warning to those who had assumed the posture the "God helps those who help themselves". The liberation-from-Egypt theme was in the process of being countered by the royal policies of the Israelite Pharaoh, Solomon. And even the ancient tenet that Yahweh was "a jealous god" before whom they should have no other gods was in grave danger of being compromised by the religious pluralism the monarchy tolerated and abetted during the days of Solomon, "the wisest of fools".[70]

---

[70] Mendenhall, Generation, p. 121, based on the thought of Jer. 9:23.

I. BIBLICAL TEXTS AND TRANSLATIONS

Kittel, Rudolf. (ed.). Biblia Hebraica. 13th ed. Revised by Albrecht Alt and Otto Eissfeldt. Stuttgart: Württembergische Bibelanstalt, 1962.

May, Herbert G. and Metzger, Bruce M. (eds.). The Oxford Annotated Bible. Revised Standard Version. New York: Oxford University Press, 1962.

The New English Bible with the Apocrypha. New York: Oxford University Press, Cambridge University Press, 1970.

Rahlfs, Alfred. (ed.). Septuaginta. 8th ed. 2 vols. Stuttgart: Württembergische Bibelanstalt, 1965.

II. REFERENCE WORKS

Aharoni, Yohanan. The Land of the Bible. London: Burns and Oakes, 1967.

Aharoni, Yohanan and Avi-Yonan, Michael. The MacMillan Bible Atlas. London: Collier-MacMillan, 1968.

Brown, Francis, Driver, Samuel R., and Briggs, Charles A. A Hebrew and English - Lexicon of the Old Testament. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1959.

Buttrick, George A. (ed.). The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible. 4 vols. New York: Abingdon Press, 1962.

Cowley, Arthur E. (ed.). Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar. Edited by E. Kautzsch, 2nd. ed. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1963.

Driver, Godfrey Rolles and Miles, John C. The Babylonian Laws. 2 vols. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1955.

Jacobsen, Thorkild. The Sumerian King List, Assyriological Studies. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1939. No. 11.

XUM

Knudtzon, Joergen A. Die El-Amarna-Tafeln. 2 vols. Vorderasiatische Bibliothek. Leipzig: Otto Zeller Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1964.

Langdon, S.H. Mythology of All Races: Vol. V: Semitic. Boston: Marshall Jones Co., 1931.

Liskowsky, Gerhard. Konkordanz zum Hebräischen Alten Testament. 2nd ed. Stuttgart: Württembergische Bibelanstalt, 1958.

Mandelkern, Solomon. Veteris Testamenti Concordantiae hebraicae atque chaldaicae. Schoken: Cura F. Margolen, 1937.

Mc Kenzie, John L. Dictionary of the Bible, Milwaukee: Bruce Publishing Co., 1965.

Mercer, Samuel A.B. (ed.). The Tell El-Amarna Tablets. 2 vols. Toronto: MacMillan Company of Canada, 1939.

Neufeld, Edward. The Hittite Laws. London: Luzac and Co., Ltd., 1951.

Nougarol, Jean. Palais Royal d'Ugarit IV, Mission de Ras Shamra IX. Paris: Imprimerie Nationale, 1955, 1956.

Pritchard, James B. Ancient Near Eastern Texts. 2nd ed. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1958.

_____. Supplement to Ancient Near Eastern Texts Relating to the Old Testament, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1969.

Reiss, A.J. A Dictionary of the Social Sciences. Edited by J. Gould and W.J. Kelb. Glencoe: The Free Press, 1964.

Schaeffer, Claude Frederic Armand. Ugaritica I - II - III Paris: P. Geuthner, 1939-1961.

_____. The Cuneiform Texts of Ras-Shamra-Ugarit. London: Oxford University Press, 1939.

Wiseman, Donald J. The Alalakh Tablets, No. 2. London: Occasional Publications of the British Institute of Archaeology in Ankara, 1953.

XUM

BOOKS

Adams, Robert McCormick. Developmental Studies in Ancient Mesopotamia. Pan American Social Science Section, Social Science Monographs. Chicago: University of Chicago, 1955. Vol. 1.

_____. Land Behind Baqdad: A History of Settlement on the Diyala Plain. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1965.

_____. The Uruk Countryside: The Natural Setting of Urban Societies. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1972.

_____. The Evolution of Urban Society: Early Mesopotamia and Prehispanic Mexico. Chicago: Aldine Publishing Co., 1966.

Adams, Robert McCormick and Kraeling, Carl (eds.) City Invincible: A Symposium on Urbanization and Cultural Development in the Ancient Near East. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1960.

Ahlström, Gösta W. Aspects of Syncretism in Israelite Religion. Lund: C.W.K. Gleerup, 1963.

Albright, William Foxwell. Archaeology and the Religion of Israel. 2nd ed. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1946.

_____. From the Stone Age to Christianity. 2nd ed. Anchor Book. Garden City: Doubleday, 1957.

_____. The Amarna Letters from Palestine, Syria, the Philistines and Phoenicia. The Cambridge Ancient History, Vol. II. Cambridge: The Cambridge Press, 1966. No. 51.

Aldred, Cyril. Egypt: The Amarna Period and the End of the Eighteenth Dynasty. The Cambridge Ancient History. Vol. II, Ch. XIX. Cambridge: The Cambridge Press, 1971.

Anati, Emanuel. Palestine before the Hebrews: A History from the Earliest Arrival of Man to the Conquest of Canaan. London: Jonathan Cape, 1963.

Anderson, Bernard. Understanding the Old Testament. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall, 1966.

Baentsch, Bruno. Exodus - Leviticus - Numeri übersetze und erklärt. Hand Kommentar zum Alten Testament. Edited by W. Nowack. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1900.

Barnett, Richard Davis. The Sea Peoples. The Cambridge Ancient History. Cambridge: The Cambridge Press, 1969. No. 68.

Bentzen, Aage. Introduction to the Old Testament I - II. 4th ed. Copenhagen: G.E.C. Gad Publishers, 1958.

Blenkinsopp, Joseph. Gibeon and Israel. Cambridge: University Press, 1972.

Bottéro, Jean. Le Problème des Habiru. Cahiers de la Societe Asiatique. Paris: Imprimerie Nationale, 1954. Vol. XII.

Braidwood, Robert J. and Howe B. Prehistoric Investigations in Iraqi Kurdustan, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1960.

Braidwood, Robert. Archaeology and the Evolutionary Thing; Evolution and Anthropology. Washington, D.C.: Anthropological Society of Washington, 1959.

Bright, John. A History of Israel. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1959.

_____. Early Israel in Recent History Writing. Studies in Biblical Theology, 19. London: SCM Press, 1960.

Brueggemann, Walter. In Man We Trust, Richmond: The John Knox Press, 1972.

Buccellati, Georgio. The Amorites of the Ur III Period. Naples: Istituto Orientale di Napoli, 1966.

_____. Cities and Nations of Ancient Syria: An Essay on Political Institutions with Special Reference to the Israelite Kingdom. Studi Semitici, No. 26. Rome: Istituto di studi del Vicino oriente, Università di Roma, 1967.

Campbell, Edward Fey. The Chronology of the Amarna Letters. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1964.

Cassuto, Umberto. Genesis: A Commentary. 2 Vols. Translated by Israel Abrahams. Jerusalem: Magnes Press, Hebrew University, 1961. Vol. I.

XUM

Chaine, Joseph. Genèse. Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1951.

Cheyne, Thomas K. Founders of Old Testament Criticism, London: Methuen and Co., 1893.

Chiera, Edward. Sumerian Epics and Myths. Oriental Institute Publications, No. 15. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1934.

Childe, Vere Gordon. Man Makes Himself. London: Watts, 1936.

_____. What Happened in History. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1946.

_____. New Light on the Most Ancient Near East, 4th ed. New York: Praeger, 1957.

Clements, Ronald E. God and Temple. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1965.

Cornill, Carl H. Introduction to the Canonical Books of the Old Testament Translated by G. H. Box. New York: G.P. Putnam's Sons, 1907.

De Vaux, Roland. La Genèse: La Bible de Jérusalem, Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 1953.

_____. Ancient Israel: Its Life and Institutions. Translated by J. McHugh. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1961.

_____. Palestine in the Early Bronze Age, The Cambridge Ancient History. Revised edition. Vol. I, Ch. 15. Cambridge: The Cambridge Press, 1965.

De Wette, Wilhelm M.L. Lehrbuch der historisch - kritischen Einleitung in die kanonischen und Apokryphischen Bücher des Alten Testaments, 8th ed. revised by E. Schrader. Berlin: G. Reimer, 1869.

Dhorme, Édouard. A Commentary on the Book of Job. Translated by H . Knight. Leiden: Brill, 1967.

Doughty, C.M. Travels in Arabic Deserta. Abridged by E. Gernett. Garden City, New York: Doubleday, 1953.

Driver, Samuel Rolles. Exodus. London: Cambridge Bible Society, 1911.

_____. The Book of Deuteronomy. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1902.

_____. An Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament. 2nd ed. New York: Scribner's Sons, 1916.

Drower, Margaret S. Ugarit. The Cambridge Ancient History, Vol. II. Cambridge: The Cambridge Press, 1968. No. 63.

Dubarle, André M. Les Sages D'Israël. Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 1946.

Eerdmans, Bernardus. Alttestamentliche Studien II: Die Vorgeschichte Israels. Giessen: Alfred Topelmann, 1908-1912.

_____. Religion of Israel. 2nd ed. Leiden: Universitaire Pers Leiden, 1947.

Eichrodt, Walter. Die Quellen der Genesis von Neuem untersucht. Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft, 31. Giessen: Alfred Topelmann, 1916.

Eissfeldt, Otto. Geschichtsschreibung im Alten Testament: Ein kritscher Bericht über die neueste Literatur dazu. Berlin: Evangelische Verlangsanstalt, 1948.

_____. Hexateuch - Synopse. Reprinted from 1922 edition. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1962.

_____. The Hebrew Kingdom, Cambridge Ancient History. V. 2. Ch. XXXIV. Cambridge: The Cambridge Press, 1965. No. 32.

_____. Palestine in the Time of the Nineteenth Dynasty: The Exodus and Wanderings, Cambridge Ancient History. V. 2. Ch. XXVI (a). Cambridge: The Cambridge Press, 1965. No. 31.

_____. Old Testament, an Introduction. Translated by Peter Ackroyd. New York: Harper and Row, 1965.

Ellis, Peter. Men and Message of the Old Testament, Collegeville Minn.: Liturgical Press, 1963.

_____. The Yahwist, Notre Dame: Fides Publishers, 1968.

XUM

Ellul, Jacques. The Meaning of the City. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1970.

Engnell, Ivan. Studies in Divine Kingship in the Ancient Near East, 2nd ed. Oxford: Blackwell, 1967.

_____. A Rigid Scrutiny. Translated and edited by John T. Willis with collaboration of Helmer Ringgren. Nashville: Vanderbilt University Press, 1969.

Fohrer, Georg. Introduction to the Old Testament. Translated by David E. Green. New York: Abingdon Press, 1968.

Franken, H.J. Palestine in the Time of the Nineteenth Dynasty: Archaeological Evidence. Cambridge Ancient History. Vol. II. Ch. XXVI. Cambridge: The Cambridge Press, 1968.

Frankfort, Henri. The Birth of Civilization in the Ancient Near East, Garden City: Doubleday, 1956.

_____. Before Philosophy. Baltimore: Penguin Books, 1967.

_____. Kingship and the Gods. 6th ed. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1969.

Frazer, George. Folklore in the Old Testament, Abridged edition. New York: The MacMillan Co., 1927.

Fustel de Coulanges, Numa D. The Ancient City: A Study on the Religion, Laws and Institutions of Greece and Rome. Garden City: Doubleday, 1956.

Gadd, Cyril John. The Cities of Babylonia, The Cambridge Ancient History. 3rd ed. Vol. I, Ch. 13. Cambridge: The Cambridge Press, 1964. No. 9.

Galling, Kurt. Die Erwählungs Tradition Israels. Giessen: A. Topelmann, 1928.

Gautier, Lucien. Introduction à l'ancien Testament, Revised 3rd ed. Lausanne: Payot, 1906.

Graf, Karl H. Die geschichtlichen Bücher des Alten Testaments: Zwei historische-kritische Untersuchungen. Leipzig: T.O. Weigel, 1866.

Gray, John. The Legacy of Canaan, The Ras Shamra Texts and Their

Relevance for the Old Testament. Supplements to Vetus Testamentum, V. Leiden: Brill, 1957.

_____. I and II Kings, Old Testament Library. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1963.

_____. The KRT Text in the Literature of Ras Shamra. 2nd ed. Leiden: Brill, 1964.

_____. The Canaanites. New York: Praeger, 1965.

_____. Archaeology and the Old Testament World. New York: Harper Torchbooks, 1965.

_____. A History of Jerusalem. New York: Praeger, 1969.

Greenberg, Moshe. The Hab/piru. The American Oriental Series. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1955. Vol. 29.

Gröndahl, Frauke. Die Personennamen der Text aus Ugarit. Rome: Typis Pontificicae Universitatis Gregorianae, 1967.

Gunkel, Hermann. What Remains of the Old Testament and Other Essays. Translated by A.K. Dallas. New York: The MacMillan Company, 1928.

_____. Genesis. 7th ed. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1966.

Hahn, Herbert F. The Old Testament in Modern Research, Revised ed. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1966.

Haldar, Alfred O. The Notion of the Desert in the Sumero-Akkadian and West Semitic Religions. Uppsala: A.B. Lundequist, 1950.

_____. Who were the Amorites, Leiden: Brill, 1971.

Hammond, Masson. The City in the Ancient World. Harvard Studies in Urban History. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1972.

Heidel, Alexander. The Gilgamesh Epic and Old Testament Parallels. Phoenix Book. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1949.

Hertzberg, Hans Wilhelm. I and II Samuel. Translated by J.S. Bowden. The Old Testament Library. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1964.

Holzinger, Heinrich. Einleitung in den Hexateuch. Freiburg: J.C.B.

XUM

Mohr, 1893.

_____. Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Numeri und Josua. Die Heilige Schrift des Alte Testament. Edited by Kautzsch. 4th ed. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1922-1923.

Hunt, Ignatius, The World of the Patriarchs. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1967.

Hupfeld, Hermann. Die Quellen der Genesis und die Art ihrer Zusammensetzung von neuen untersucht. Berlin: Wiegandt and Grieben, 1853.

Jacob, Edmond. Théologie de l'Ancien Testament. Neuchâtel: Delachaux et Niestlé, 1955.

Jastrow, Morris. The Religion of Babylonia and Assyria. Boston: Ginn and Co., 1898.

Jawad, A.J. The Advent of the Era of Townships in Northern Mesopotamia. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1965.

Jepsen, Alfred. Die Quellen des Königbuchs. 2nd ed. Halle: M. Niemeyer, 1953.

Johnson, Aubrey R. The Sacred Kingship in Ancient Israel. 2nd ed. Cardiff: University of Wales Press, 1967.

Johnson, Marshall. The Purpose of Biblical Genealogies. London: Cambridge University Press, 1969.

Kenyon, Kathleen Mary. Digging up Jericho. London: Benn, 1957.

_____. Archaeology in the Holy Land. New York: Praeger, 1960.

_____. Amorites and Canaanites. London: The British Academy, 1966.

_____. Palestine in the Middle Bronze Age, The Cambridge Ancient History. Revised ed. Vol. II, Ch. III. Cambridge: The Cambridge Press, 1966. No. 48.

Keunen, Abraham. The Religion of Israel to the Fall of the Jewish State. 3 vols. Translated from the Dutch by Alfred Heath May. London: Williams and Norgate, 1874-75.

XUM

King, Leonard William. A History of Sumer and Akkad. London, Chatto and Windus, 1916.

Kramer, Samuel. The Sumerians. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1963.

Kupper, Jean-Robert. North Mesopotamia and Syria, The Cambridge Ancient History. Vol. 2, Ch. 1. Cambridge: The Cambridge Press, 1963. No. 14.

Lampl, Paul. Cities and Planning in the Ancient Near East, New York: George Braziller, 1968.

Lapidus, Ira Marvin. Middle Eastern Studies: A Symposium. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1970.

Lewy, Emmanuel. The Growth of the Pentateuch, Introduction by R. Pfeiffer. New York: Bookman Associates, 1955.

Liverani, Mario. Storia di Ugarit: Nell 'Età degli Archivi Politici. Studi Semitici 6. Rome: Università di Roma, 1962.

Mendenhall, George. The Tenth Generation: the Origins of the Biblical Tradition, Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1973.

Mettinger, Tryggve N.D. Solomonic State Officials: A Study of the Civil Government Officials of the Israelite Monarchy. Coniectanea Biblica Old Testament Series, 5. Lund: C.W.K. Gleerup, 1971.

Morgan, Lewis Henry. Ancient Society; or researches in the laws of human progress from savagery through barbarism to civilization. Edited with an introduction by Eleanor Burke Leacock. Cleveland: World Publishing Company, 1963.

Moscati, Sabatino. The Semites in Ancient History: An Inquiry into the Settlement of the Bedouin and their Political Establishment, Cardiff: University of Wales Press, 1959.

Mowinckel, Sigmund. The Psalms in Israel's Worship. 2 vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1962. Vol. II.

_____. Erwägungen zur Pentateuch Quellen frage. Trondheim: Universitetsforlaget, 1964.

_____. The Two Sources of the Pre-Deuteronomic Primaeval History (JE) in Genesis 1-11, Oslo: Avhandlinger utgitt av det Norske Videnskaps-Akademi, 1937.

XUM

Mumford, Lewis. The City in History. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Co., 1961.

McKane, William. Proverbs. Old Testament Library. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1970.

McKenzie, John L. The World of the Judges. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1966.

_____. A Theology of the Old Testament. Garden City: Doubleday, 1974.

Nielsen, Eduard. Shechem: a Traditio-Historical Investigation. Copenhagen: G.E.C. Gad, 1959.

North, Christopher. The Old Testament Interpretation of History. London: The Epworth Press, 1946.

Noth, Martin. Das Buch Josua. Handbuch zum Alten Testament, Vol. 7. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1953.

_____. History of Israel. 2nd ed. New York: Harper and Row, 1958.

_____. Exodus. Translated by J.S. Boroden. Old Testament Library. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1962.

_____. Das System der zwölf Stämme Israels. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1966.

_____. Numbers. London: S.C.M. Press, 1968.

_____. Überlieferungsgeschichte des Pentateuch. Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer Verlag, 1948.

_____. A History of Pentateuchal Traditions. Introduction by B.W. Anderson, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1972.

O'Callaghan, Robert T. Aram Naharaim: A Contribution to the History of Upper Mesopotamia in the Second Millenium B.C. Analecta Orientalia No. 26, Rome: Pontificium Institutum Biblicum, 1948.

Oppenheim, A. Leo. Ancient Mesopotamia: Portrait of a Dead Civilization. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1964.

Parrot, André. The Tower of Babel. London: SCM Press, 1955.

XUM

_____. Babylon and the Old Testament. London: SCM Press, 1958.

Pederson, Johannes. Israel, Its Life and Culture II. 4 vols. Translated by A. Moeller and A.I. Fausboll. London: Cumberlege, 1946-1947.

Pfeiffer, Robert H. Introduction to the Old Testament. Revised ed. New York: Harper and Row, 1948.

Polanyi, Karl, Arensberg, Conrad M. and Pearson, Harry W. Trade and Market in the Early Empires. Glencoe: The Free Press, 1957.

Posener, G. Syria and Palestine c. 2160-1780 B.C.E. Relations with Egypt. The Cambridge Ancient History. Vol. 1, Pt. 2, Ch. 25. Cambridge: The Cambridge Press, 1965. No. 29.

Roux, Georges. Ancient Iraq. London: Allen and Unwin Ltd., 1964.

Rowley, Harold H. From Joseph to Joshua. London: Oxford University Press, 1950.

_____. The Growth of the Old Testament. London: Hutchinson House, 1950.

_____. The Old Testament in Modern Study. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1961.

Sahlins, Marshall D. Tribesmen. Engelwood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1968.

Scott, Robert B.Y. The Way of Wisdom. New York: MacMillan, 1971.

Simpson, Cuthbert A. Composition of the Book of Judges. Oxford: Blackwell, 1957.

_____. The Earliest Traditions in Israel: A Critical Analysis of the Pre-Deutoronomic Narrative of the Hexateuch. Oxford: Blackwell, 1948.

Sjoberg, Gideon. The Preindustrial City: Past and Present. New York: The Free Press, 1960.

Skinner, John. A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Genesis. International Critical Commentary. Vol. 1, 2nd ed. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1930.

XUM

Smend, Rudolph. Die Erzählung des Hexateuch auf ihre Quellen untersucht. Leipzig: G. Reimer, 1912.

Smith, George A. The Chaldean Account of Genesis. New York: Charles Scribner and Sons, 1880.

Smith , William Robertson. Lectures on the Religion of the Semites: The Fundamental Institutions. 3rd ed. New York: KTAV Publishing House, 1969.

Speiser, Ephraim A. Genesis: Anchor Bible. Vol. 1 Garden City: Doubleday, 1964.

Thesiger, Wilfred. The Marsh Arabs. New York: Dutton, 1964.

Thomas, David Winton. Archaeology and Old Testament Study. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1967.

Unger, Eric. Babylon: die Heilige Stadt nach der Beschreibung der Babylonier. Berlin und Leipzig: Walter de Gruyter and Co., 1931.

Van Seters, John. The Hyksos. Yale University Press: New Haven, 1966.

von Rad, Gerhard. Wisdom in Israel. New York: Abingdon Press, 1972.

_____. Genesis, A Commentary. Translated by John Marks. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1961.

_____. Old Testament Theology. Translated by D.M.G. Stalker. New York: Harper and Row, 1962-1965. Vol. 1.

_____. The Problem of the Hexateuch and Other Essays. Translated by E.W.T. Dicken. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1966.

Vriezen, Theodorus C. An Outline of Old Testament Theology. Oxford: Blackwell, 1958.

Weber, Max. Ancient Judaism. Translated and edited by H.H. Gerth and D. Martindale. New York: The Free Press, 1952.

_____. The City. New York: Free Press Paperback, 1966.

Weippert, Manfred. The Settlement of the Israelite Tribes in Palestine. Translated by J.D. Martin. Naperville, Illinois: Alec R. Allenson Inc., 1971.

XUM

Weiser Artur. The Psalms. Old Testament Library. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1962.

_____. The Old Testament: Its Formation and Development, Translated by Dorothea M. Barton, 4th ed., New York: Association Press, 1968.

Wellhausen, Julius. Proglomena to the History of Ancient Israel. Translated by J. Sutherland Black and Allan Menzies. Cleveland: The World Publishing Company, 1957.

_____. Die Composition des Hexateuchs und der Historischen Bücher des Alten Testaments. 4th ed. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter and Co., 1963.

Westermann, Claus. Genesis. Biblischer Kommentar Altes Testament, 1966-1972. Neukirchen: Neukirchener Verlag des Erziehungsvereins, 1971.

Wilson, John A. The Culture of Ancient Egypt, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1968.

Wittfogel, Karl A. Oriental Despotism: A Comparative Study of Total Power. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1963.

Wolf, Eric R. Peasants, Engelwood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1966.

Wright, G. Ernest. The God Who Acts. London: SCM Press, Ltd. 1952.

_____. Biblical Archaelogy. Philadelphia, Westminster Press, 1957.

_____. Old Testament Against Its Environment. London: SCM Press, 1957.

Yeivin, Shemuel. The Israelite Conquest of Canaan. Publications de l'Institut historique et Archéologique néérlandais de Stambaul, XXVII. 1971.

Zimmern, Heinrich. The Babylonian and Hebrew Genesis. Translated by J. Hutchison. London: D. Nutt, 1901.

XUM

ARTICLES

Adams, Robert McC. "The Origin of Cities," Scientific American 203 (1960), pp. 153-168.

_____. "Patterns of Urbanization in Early Southern Mesopotamia," Man, Settlement and Urbanism. Edited by P.J. Ucko, Ruth Tringham, and G.W. Dimbleby. London: Duckworth, 1972. pp. 735-750.

_____. "Urban Revolution," International Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences, Vol. 16. Edited by David L. Sills. Chicago: MacMillan Co. and The Free Press, Chicago: 1968. pp. 201-207.

Aharoni, Yohanan. "Problems of the Israelite Conquest in the Light of Archaeological Discoveries," Antiquity and Survival 2 (1957), pp. 131-150.

_____. "New Aspects of the Israelite Occupation in the North," Near Eastern Archaeology in the Twentieth Century: Essays in Honor of Nelson Glueck. Edited by James A. Sanders. New York: Doubleday, 1970. pp. 254-265.

_____. "The Settlement of Canaan," The World History of Jewish People. Vol. 3.London: Allen, 1971. pp. 94-128.

Ahlström, Gösta W. "Der Prophet Nathan und der Tempelbau," Vetus Testamentum 11 (1961), pp. 113-27.

Albright, William Foxwell. "Abram the Hebrew: A New Archaeological Interpretation," Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research 163 (1961), pp. 36-54.

_____. "The Babylonian Antediluvian Kings," Journal of the American Oriental Society 43 (1923), pp. 323-329.

_____. "The Babylonian Matter in the Predeuteronomic Primeval History," Journal of Biblical Literature 58 (1939), pp. 87-103.

_____. "Canaanite hapši and Hebrew hopšî again," Journal of The Palestine Oriental Society 6 (1926), pp. 106-108.

_____. "Canaanite hopši 'free' in the Amarna Tablets," Journal of the Palestine Oriental Society 4 (1924), pp. 169-170.

_____. "The Egyptian Empire in Asia in the Twenty-first Century B.C.," Journal of the Palestine Oriental Society 8 (1929), pp. 223-256.

_____. "Elements in the Story of Joseph," Journal of Biblical Literature 37 (1918), pp. 111-143.

_____. "The Excavations of Tell Beth Mirsim II, The Bronze Age," Annual of the American School of Oriental Research 17, New Haven: Yale University Press, 1938. pp. 1-15.

_____. "Gilgames and Engidu, Mesopotamian Genii of Fertility," Journal of the American Oriental Society 40 (1920), pp. 307-335.

_____. "The Israelite Conquest of Canaan in the Light of Archaeology," Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Society 74 (1939), pp. 11-23.

_____. "Jethro, Hobab and Reuel in Early Hebrew Tradition," Catholic Biblical Quarterly 25 (1963), pp. 1-11.

_____. "New Canaanite Historical and Mythological Data," Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research 63 (1936), pp. 23-32.

_____. "The Role of the Canaanites in the History of Civilization," Bible and the Ancient Near East. Edited by G. Ernest Wright. Garden City: Doubleday, 1965, pp. 438-487.

_____. "Some Canaanite-Phoenician Sources of Hebrew Wisdom," Supplement to Vetus Testamentum 3 (1955), pp. 1-15.

_____. "Two Little Understood Amarna Letters from the Middle Jordan Valley," Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research 89 (1943), pp. 7-17.

Alt, Albrecht. "Formation of the Israelite State," Essays on Old Testament History and Religion. Translated by R.A. Wilson. Garden City: Doubleday, 1966. pp. 225-309.

_____. "The Settlement of the Israelites in Palestine," Essays on Old Testament History and Religion. Translated from the German by R.A. Wilson. Garden City: Doubleday, 1966. pp. 175-221.

XUM

Alonso-Schökel, Luis. "Motivos sapienciales y de alianza en Gn. 2-3," Biblica 43 (1962), pp. 295-315.

Amiran, Ruth. "The Beginnings of Urbanization in Canaan," Near Eastern Archaeology in the Twentieth Century: Essays in Honor of Nelson Glueck. Edited by James A. Sanders. New York: Doubleday, 1970. pp. 83-100.

Anderson, Bernard. "The Place of Shechem in the Bible," The Biblical Archaeologist 20 (1957), pp. 10-19.

Anderson, Robert T. "The Role of the Desert in Israelite Thought," Journal of Bible and Religion 27 (1959), pp. 41-44.

Barrois, G.A. "Salem," Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible. Vol. 4 New York: Abingdon Press, 1962. p. 166.

Bartlett, J.R. "The Rise and Fall of the Kingdom of Edom," Palestine Exploration Quarterly 104 (1972), pp. 26-37.

Barton, George A. "Origins of civilizations in Africa and Mesopotamia, Their relative antiquity and interplay," American Philosophical Society Proceedings, Vol. 68. Philadelphia: Lancaster Press, 1929. pp. 303-312.

_____. "The Habiri of the El-Amarna Tablets and the Hebrew Conquest of Palestine," Journal of Biblical Literature 48 (1929), pp. 144-148.

_____. "The Possible Mention of Joshua's Conquest in the El-Amarna Letters," Expository Times 47 (1935-1936), p. 380.

Bauer, Johannes B. "Kain und Abel," Theologisch-Praktische Quartalschrift 103 (1955), pp. 126-133.

Begrich, Joachim. "Die Paradieserzählung. Ein literaturgeschichtliche Studien," Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 50 (1932), pp. 93-116.

_____. "Sofer und Mazkir," Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 58 (1940), pp. 1-29.

Ben-gavriel, M.Y. "Das nomadische Ideal in der Bibel" Stimmen der Zeit 171 (1962-1963), pp. 253-263.

Berry, George R. "The Hebrew Word נרה " Journal of Biblical Literature 50 (1931), pp. 207-210.

Blenkinsopp, Joseph. "Theme and Motif in the Succession History (2 Sam. XI 2ff.) And the Yahwist Corpus," Supplement to Vetus Testamentum 15 (1967), pp. 44-57.

_____. "Did Saul Make Gibeon His Capital?" Vetus Testamentum 24 (1974), pp. 1-7.

_____. "Structure and Style in Judges 13-16," Journal of Biblical Literature 82 (1963), pp. 65-76.

_____. "Stylistics of Old Testament Poetry," Biblica 44(1965), pp. 352-358.

Boecker, Hans. "Erwägungen zum Amt des Mazkir," Theogische Literaturzeitung 17 (1961), pp. 212-216.

Böhl, Franz M.Th. "Die Etymologie von Babel, Genesis 11:9," Zeitschrift für die Altestamentliche Wissenschaft 3 (1916), pp. 110-113.

Bottéro, Jean. "The First Semite Empire," The Near East: Early Civilizations. Edited by J. Bottéro, E. Casson, and J. Vercoutter. New York: Delacorte Press, 1967. pp. 91-132.

Braidwood, Robert J. and Linda. "Earliest Village Communities of Southwestern Asia," Journal of World History 1 (1954), pp. 278-310.

Braidwood, Robert J. and Willey, G.R. "Southwest Asia beyond the Lands of the Mediterranean Littoral," Courses Toward Urban Life. Chicago: Aldine, 1962. pp. 132-146.

Brekelmans, Chr. H.W. "Exodus XVIII and the Origins of Yahwism," Oudtestamentische Studiën 10 (1954), pp. 215-224.

Brock-Utne, A. "Genesis 11: 1-9 in Licht der Kulturgeschichte des nahen Orients." Archiv für Religionsgeschichte 32 (1935), pp. 293-305.

Brueggemann, Walter. "David and His Theologian," Catholic Biblical Quarterly 30 (1968), pp. 156-181.

Bruston, Charles. "Les deux Jéhovistes," Revue de Théologie et de Philosophie 18 (1885), pp. 5-34, 499-528, 602-637.

XUM

_____. "Les quatre sources des lois de l'exode," Revue de Théologie et de Philosophie 16 (1883), pp. 329-360.

Buccellati, Georgio. "The Enthronement of the King and the Capital City in Texts from Ancient Mesopotamia and Syria," Essays in Honor of A.L. Oppenheim, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1970. pp. 54-61.

Budde, Karl. "Die Biblische Paradiesegeschichte," Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 60 (1932). pp. 1-92.

_____. "The Nomadic Ideal in the Old Testament," The New World 4 (1895), pp. 726-745.

Campbell, Edward Fey. "The Amarna Letters and the Amarna Period," Biblical Archaeologist 23 (1960), pp. 1-22.

_____. "The Excavation of Shechem and the Biblical Tradition," Biblical Archaeologist 26 (1963), pp. 1-27.

Castellino, G. "Les origines de la civilization selon les textes bibliques et les textes cunéiformes," Supplement to Vetus Testamentum. 4 (1957), pp. 116-137.

Causse, Antonin. "La crise de la solidarité de famille et de clan dans l'ancien Israël," Revue d'Histoire de la Philosophie Réligieuse 10 (1930), pp. 24-60.

Cazelles, Henri. "Hebreu, Ubra et Hapiru," Syria 35 (1958), pp. 198-217.

_____. "Pentateuque," Supplément au Dictionaire de la Bible 39 Paris: Letouzey & Ane, Editeurs, 1964. cols. 771-803.

Chamberlayne, John H. "Kinship Relations Among the Early Hebrews," Numen 10 (1963), pp. 153-164.

Cheyne, Thomas K. "Cainites," Encyclopedia Biblica 4 vols. Edited by T.K. Cheyne and J. Sutherland Black. London: Adam and Charles Black, 1899. Vol. 1. cols. 625-626.

Chiera, Edward. "Habiru and Hebrews," American Journal of Semitic Languages and Literatures. 49 (1932-1933), pp. 115-124.

Childe, Vere Gordon. "The Urban Revolution," Town Planning Review 21 (1950), April, pp. 3-17.

XUM

_____. "Early Forms of Society," A History of Technology I Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1954. pp. 42-47.

_____. "Civilization, Cities and Towns," Antiquity 31 (1957), pp. 36-38.

Clapp, Frederick Gardiner. "The Site of Sodom and Gomorrah: Diversity of News," American Journal of Archaeology 40 (1936), pp. 323-344.

Coppens, Joseph. "Une nouvelle date pour le document Yahviste," Miscellanées Bibliques: Analecta Lovaniensa Biblica et Orientalia Ser. 4, Fasc. 34, 40, 1966, pp. 567-572.

Crawford, H.E.W. "Stimuli Towards Urbanization in South Mesopotamia," Man, Settlement and Urbanism. Edited by P.J. Ucko, Ruth Tringham, and G.W. Dimbleby. London: Duckworth, 1972. pp. 761-762.

Crenshaw, James L. "Method in Determining Wisdom Influence Upon 'Historical' Literature," Journal of Biblical Literature 88 (1969), pp. 129-142.

Crook, Margaret B. "Some Cultural Principles in Hebrew Civilization," Journal of Biblical Literature 50 (1931), pp. 156-175.

Dahood, Mitchell. "Canaan and the Canaanites," New Catholic Encyclopedia. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1966. Vol. 3. pp. 1-2.

Davies, G. Henton. "The Yahwistic Tradition in the Eighth-Century Prophets," Studies in Old Testament Prophecy Presented to Th. H. Robinson. Edited by H.H. Rowley. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1946. pp. 37-51.

De Vaux, Roland. "Titres et Fonctionnaires égyptiens à la cour de David et de Salomon," Revue Biblique 48 (1939), pp. 394-405.

_____. "A propos du second centenaire d'Astruc réflexions sur l'état actuel de la critique du Pentateuque," Supplement to Vetus Testamentum 1 (1953), pp. 182-198.

_____. "Le Pays de Canaan," Journal of the American Oriental Society 88 (1968), pp. 23-30.

_____. "Les Hurites et les Horites," Compte Rendus de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres. Oct. 1968, pp. 427-436.

XUM

_____. "Le Problème des Hapiru après quinze années," Journal of Near Eastern Studies 27 (1968), pp. 221-228.

_____. "On Right and Wrong Uses of Archaeology," Near Eastern Archaeology in the Twentieth Century: Essays in Honor of Nelson Glueck. Edited by James A. Sanders. New York: Doubleday, 1970 pp. 64-80.

Dever William G. "The Middle Bronze Period in Syria and Palestine," Near Eastern Archaeology in the Twentieth Century: Essays in Honor of Nelson Glueck. Edited by James A. Sanders, New York: Doubleday, 1970. pp. 130-163.

Dewey, Robert. "The Rural-Urban Continuum: Real but Relatively Unimportant," American Journal of Sociology 66(1960), pp. 60-66.

Dhorme, Édouard P. "Les Habiru et les Hébreux," Journal of the Palestine Oriental Societies 4 (1924), pp. 162-168.

_____. "La Question des Habiri," Revue de l'histoire des religions 118 (1938), pp. 170-187.

Dombart, T. "Der Turmbau zu Babel," Orientalische Literaturzeitung 21 (1918), pp. 161-165.

Dostal, Walter. "The Evolution of Bedouin Life," Studi Semitici 2 (1959), pp. 11-34.

Dougherty, Raymond P. "Cuneiform Parallels to Solomon's Provisioning System," Annual of the American Schools of Oriental Research 5 (1925), 31, 45 no. 70.

Edzard, Dietz O. "The Early Dynastic Period," The Near East: The Early Civilizations. Edited by J. Bottéro, E. Casson, and J. Vercautter. New York: Delacorte Press, 1967. pp. 52-90.

Eisler, Robert "Das Qainzeichen und die Qeniter," Le Monde Oriental 23 (1929), pp. 48-56.

_____. "Loan Words in Semitic Languages meaning 'town'," Antiquity 13 (1939), pp. 449-455.

Eissfeldt, Otto. "The Literature of Israel: Modern Criticism," Record and Revelation. Edited by H.W.Robinson. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1938. pp. 74-109.

XUM

_____. "Silo und Jerusalem," Supplement to Vetus Testamentum 4 (1957), pp. 138-147.

_____. "Die Ältesten Traditionen Israels," Beihefte Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 71. Giessen: Alfred Topelmann, 1950. pp. 15-42.

_____. "Genesis," Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible. Vol. 2, New York: Abingdon Press, 1962. pp. 366-380.

Engnell, Ivan. "Methodological Aspects of Old Testament Study," Vetus Testamentum 7 (1960), pp. 13-30.

Evans, George. "'Coming' and 'Going' at the City Gates," Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research 150 (1958), pp. 28-33.

_____. "Ancient Mesopotamian Assemblies," Journal of the American Oriental Society 78 (1958), pp. 1-11.

_____. "'Gates' and 'Streets' Urban Institutions in Old Testament Times," Journal of Religious History 2 (1962), pp. 1-12.

Fairman, H.W. "Town Planning in Pharaonic Egypt," Town Planning Review 20 (1965), pp. 32-51.

Falkenstein, Adam. "La Cité-Temple sumerienne," Journal of World History 1.4 (April, 1954), pp. 784-814.

_____. "The Prehistory and Protohistory of Western Asia," The Near East: The Early Civilizations. Edited by J. Bottéro, E. Cassin, J. Vercoutter, New York: Delacarte Press, 1967. pp. 1-52.

Fensham, F. Charles. "Did a Treaty between the Israelites and the Kenites Exist?" Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research 175 (1965), pp. 51-54.

Fichtner, Joseph. "Die etymologische Ätiologie in den Namengebungen der geschichtlichen Bücher des Alten Testaments," Vetus Testamentum 6 (1956), pp. 372-396.

Finkelstein, Jacob J. "The Antediluvian Kings: A University of California Tablet," Journal of Cuneiform Studies 17 (1963), pp. 39-51.

XUM

Fish, T. "The Place of the Small State in the Political and Cultural History of Ancient Mesopotamia," Bulletin of the John Rylands Library 28 (1944), pp. 83-98.

Flannery, Kent V. "The Origins of the Village as a Settlement Type in Mesoamerica and the Near East: A Comparative Study," Man, Settlement and Urbanism. Edited by P.J. Ucko, R. Tringham and G.W. Dimbleby. London: Duckworth, 1972. pp. 23-54.

Flight, John W. "The Nomadic Ideal and the Ideal of the Old Testament," Journal of Biblical Literature 42 (1955), pp. 158-226.

Flugge, Paul. "Lamechs Tochter Naema," Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 62 (1950), p. 314.

Franken, H.J. "The Excavations at Deir 'Alla in Jordan," Vetus Testamentum 10 (1960), pp. 386-393.

Frankfort, Henri. "Town Planning in Ancient Mesopotamia," Town Planning Review 21 (July, 1950), pp. 99-115.

Frentz, A. "Der Turmbau zu Genesis 11: 1-9," Vetus Testamentum 19 (1969), pp. 183-195.

Gabriel, Johannes. "Die Kaintengenealogie Genesis 4: 17-24," Biblica 40 (1959), pp. 409-427.

Gelb, Ignace J. "The Early History of the West Semitic Peoples," Journal of Cuneiform Studies 15 (1961), pp. 27-47.

Gemser, Berend. "The Rib - or Controversy - Pattern in the Hebrew Mentality," Supplement to Vetus Testamentum 3 (1955), pp. 120-137.

Gibson, John C.L. "Observations on Some Important Ethnic Terms in the Pentateuch," Journal of Near Eastern Studies 20 (1961), pp. 217-238.

Ginsberg, Harold J. "Women singers and wailers among the northern Canaanites," Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research 72 (1938), pp. 13-15.

Glock, Albert E. "Early Israel as the Kingdom of Yahweh," Concordia Theological Monthly 41 (1970), pp. 558-605.

XUM

Glueck, Nelson. "The Civilization of the Edomites," The Biblical Archaeologist 10 (1947), pp. 77-84.

_____. "The Civilization of the Edomites," The Biblical Archaeologist Reader II. Edited by David Noel Freedman and Edward F. Campbell. Garden City: Doubleday Anchor Books, 1964, pp. 51-58.

_____. "The Civilization of the Moabites," American Journal of Archaeology 38 (1934), pp. 212-218.

_____. "Factors Influencing the Rise of Civilization in the Upland: Illustrated by the Negev," City Invincible. A Symposium on Urbanization and Cultural Development in the Ancient Near East. Edited by Robert McC. Adams and C. Kraeling. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1960. pp. 46-60.

_____. "Surface Finds in Edom and Moab," Palestinian Exploration Quarterly 71 (1939), pp. 188-192.

_____. "Some Ancient Towns in the Plains of Moab," Bulletin of the American School of Oriental Research 91 (1943), pp. 7-26.

_____. "Kenites and Kenizzites," Palestine Exploration Quarterly 72 (1940), pp. 22-24.

_____. "Explorations in the Land of Ammon," Bulletin of the American School of Oriental Research 68 (1937), pp. 13-21.

Goff, Beatrice L. "The Lost Yahwistic Account of the Conquest of Canaan," Journal of Biblical Literature 53 (1934), pp. 241-249.

Goodenough, Edwin R. "Kingship in Early Israel," Journal of Biblical Literature 48 (1929), pp. 169-205.

Gordis, Robert. "Democratic Origins in Ancient Israel - The Biblical 'edah'." Alexander Marx Jubilee Volume. Edited by S. Lieberman. New York: Jewish Theological Seminary of America, 1950. pp. 369-388.

Gordon, Cyrus J. "Abraham and the Merchants of Ura," Journal of Near Eastern Studies 17 (1958), pp. 28-31.

XUM

_____. "Abraham of Ur," Hebrew and Semitic Studies presented to G.R. Driver. Edited by D.W. Thomas and W.D. Mottardy. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1963. pp. 78-84.

_____. "Canaan in the Egyptian New Kingdom Period: Cultural and Religious Life," The World History of the Jewish People Vol. 3, London: Allen, 1970. pp. 52-65.

_____. "Hebrew Origins in the Light of Recent Discovery," Biblical and Other Studies. Edited by Alexander Altmann. Cambridge: Harvard Press, 1963. pp. 3-14.

Gray, John. "Canaanite Kingship in Theory and Practice," Vetus Testamentum 2 (1952), pp. 193-220.

_____. "Feudalism in Ugarit and Early Israel," Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 64 (1952), pp. 49-55.

_____. "Social Aspects of Canaanite Religion," Supplement to Vetus Testamentum 15 (1968), pp. 170-192.

Gray, Mary P. "The Habiru-Hebrew Problem," Hebrew Union College Annual 29 (1958), pp. 135-202.

Greenberg, Moshe. "Hab/piru and Hebrews," The World History of the Jewish People Vol. 2 London: Allen, 1970. pp. 188-200.

Grohman, E.D. "Moab," Interpreters Dictionary of the Bible Vol. 3. New York: Abingdon Press, 1962. 409-419.

Gruppe, Otto. "Kain," Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 39 (1921), pp. 67-76.

Guillaume, Alfred. "The Habiru, the Hebrews, and the Arabs." Palestine Exploration Quarterly 78 (1946), pp. 64-85.

Gunkel, Hermann. "Kain und Abel," Die Religion Geschichte und Gegenwart II (1929), cols. 584-585.

Hallevy, Raphael. "The Canaanite Period: A Culture Clash," Tarbiz 35 (1965), pp. 95-102 (Hebrew).

Hallo, William W. "A Sumerian Amphictyony," Journal of Cuneiform Studies 14 (1960), pp. 88-96.

XUM

_____. "Antedeluvian Cities," Journal of Cuneiform Studies 23 (1971), pp. 57-67.

Haran, Michael. "Studies in the account of the Levitical Cities I & II: Utopia and Historical Reality," Journal of Biblical Literature 80 (1961), pp. 45-54, 156-165.

Harland, James Penrose. "Sodom and Gomorrah," The Biblical Archaeologist 5 (1942), pp. 17-32; 6 (1943), pp. 41-54.

Hauer, Charles E. "Who was Zadok," Journal of Biblical Literature 82 (1963), pp. 89-94.

Hauret, Charles. "Genesis 4:1 (avec Jahwe j'ai produit un homme)," Recherches de Science Religieuse 32 (1958), pp. 358-367.

_____. "Réflexions pessimistes et optimistes sur la Genèse 4: 17-24," Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarium Lovaniensium 12 (1959), pp. 358-365.

Hempel, Johannes. "The Literature of Israel: The Contents of the Literature," Record and Revelation. Edited by H.W. Robinson, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1938. pp. 45-73.

Henrey, K.H. "Land Tenure in the Old Testament," Palestine Exploration Quarterly 86 (1954), pp. 5-15.

Holzinger, Heinrich. "R. Smend, J E in den geschicht lichen Büchern des A T," Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 39 (1921), pp. 181-217.

Hooke, Sidney H. "Cain and Abel," The Siege Perilous: Essays in Biblical Anthropology and Kindred Subjects, London: SCM Press, 1956. pp. 66-73.

Humbert, Paul. Review of W. Rudolph's Der Elohist von Exodus bis Josua in Theologische Literaturzeitung 63 (1938), cols. 415-418.

Hummel, Horace. "The Influence of Archaeological Evidence on the Reconstruction of Religion in Monarchical Israel," Concordia Theological Monthly 41 (1970), pp. 542-557.

Isserlin, B.S.J. "Israelite and Pre-Israelite Place Names in Palestine," Palestine Exploration Quarterly 89 (1957), pp. 133-144.

Jack, J.W. "New Light on the Habiru-Hebrew Question," Palestine Exploration Quarterly 72 (1940), pp. 95-115.

Jacobsen, Thorkild. "Primitive Democracy in Ancient Mesopotamia," Journal of Near Eastern Studies 2 (1943), pp. 159-172.

_____. "Early Political Development in Early Mesopotamia," Zeitschrift für Assyriologie 52 (1957), pp. 91-140.

Jepsen, Alfred. "Amah und Schiphchah," Vetus Testamentum 8 (1958), pp. 293-297.

_____. "Amah und Schiphschah - Nachtrag V.T., VIII 3," Vetus Testamentum 8 (1958), p. 425.

Kantor, Helen J. "Further Evidence for Early Mesopotamian Relations with Egypt." Journal of Near Eastern Studies 11 (1952), pp. 239-250.

Kapelrud, Arvid S. "Temple Building, a Task for Gods and Kings," Orientalia 32 (1963), pp. 56-62.

Kassis, H.E. "Gath and the Structure of the 'Phillistine' Society," Journal of Biblical Literature 84 (1965), pp. 259-271.

Keller, Carl A. "Keniter," Die Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart, 3rd ed. Edited by Kurt Galling. 6 vols. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1957-1962. Vol. 3, col. 1243.

Kemp, B.J. "Fortified Towns in Nubia," Man, Settlement and Urbanism, Edited by P.J. Ucko, R. Tringham & G.W. Dimbleby. London: Duckworth, 1972. pp. 651-656.

_____. "Temple and Town in Ancient Egypt," Man, Settlement and Urbanism. Edited by P.J. Ucko, R. Tringham & G.W. Dimbleby. London: Duchworth, 1972. pp. 657-680.

Kenyon, Kathleen. "Jericho and Its Setting in Near Eastern History," Antiquity 30 (1956), pp. 184-195.

Key, Andrew F. "The Giving of Proper Names in the Old Testament," Journal of Biblical Literature 83 (1964), pp. 55-59.

Kilmer, Anne D. "The Mesopotamian Concept of Overpopulation and Its Solution as Reflected in the Mythology," Orientalia 41 (1972), pp. 160-177.

XUM

Kraeling, Emil G.H. "The Tower of Babel," Journal of the American Oriental Society 40 (1920), pp. 276-281.

_____. "The Interpretation of the Name 'Noah' in Genesis 5: 29," Journal of Biblical Literature 48 (1929), pp. 138-143.

_____. "The Origin of the Name 'Hebrews'," American Journal of Semitic Languages 58 (1941), pp. 237-253.

Kramer, Samuel. "Man's Golden Age: A Parallel to Genesis 11:1," Journal of American Oriental Society 63 (1943), pp. 191-194.

_____. "Sumerian Literature and the Bible," Analecta Biblica 12 (1959), pp. 185-204.

_____. "The Babel of Tongues," Journal of American Oriental Society 88 (1968), pp. 108-111.

Kraus, Fritz R. "Le rôle des temples depuis la troisième dynastie d'Ur jusqu'à la première dynastie de Babylone," Cahiers d'Histoire Mondiale 1 (1954), pp. 518-545.

Kupper, Jean-Robert. "Les rôle des nomades dans L'Histoire de la Mésopotamie," Journal of the Economic and Social History of the Orient 2 (1959), pp. 113-127.

Lambert, Wilfred G. "A New Look at the Babylonian Background of Genesis," Journal of Theological Studies 16 (1965), pp. 287-300.

Landes, George M. "The Material Civilization of the Ammonites," The Biblical Archaeologist Reader II. Edited by David Noel Freedman and Edward F. Campbell. Garden City: Doubleday Anchor Books, 1964. pp. 69-88.

Lapp, Paul. "Palestine in the Early Bronze Age," Near Eastern Archaeology in the Twentieth Century: Essays in Honor of Nelson Glueck, Edited by James A. Sanders. New York: Doubleday, 1970. pp. 101-131.

_____. "The Conquest of Palestine in Archaeology," Concordia Theological Monthly 38 (1967), pp. 283-300.

Lehming, Sigo. "Zur Überlieferungsgeschichte von Genesis 34," Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 70 (1958), pp. 228-250.

XUM

_____. "Zur Erzählung von der Geburt der Jacobsöhne," Vetus Testamentum 13 (1963), pp. 74-81.

Lewy, Hildegarde. "The Nuzi Feudal System," Orientalia 11 (1942), pp. 1-40; 209-250.

Lewy, Julius. "The Assyrian-Babylonian Cult of the Moon and its Culmination at the Time of Nabonidus," Hebrew Union College Annual 19 (1946), pp. 405-489.

Lindblom, Christian Johannes. "The Political Background of the Shiloh Oracle," Supplement to Vetus Testamentum 1 (1953), pp. 78-87.

Lipinski, Edward. "Nimrod et Assur," Revue Biblique 73 (1966), pp. 77-93.

Liver, Jacob. "The Book of the Acts of Solomon," Biblica 48 (1967), pp. 75-101.

_____. "The Israelite Tribes," The World History of the Jewish People Vol. 3. London: Allen, 1971. pp. 183-211.

Lods, Adolphe. "The Religion of Israel: Origins," Record and Revelation Edited by H. Wheeler Robinson. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1938. pp. 187-215.

Long, Burke O. "The Problem of Etiological Narrative in the Old Testament," Beihefte Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 108. Giessen: A. Topelmann, 1968.

Malamat, Abraham. "Mari and the Bible: Some Patterns of Tribal Organization and Institutions," Journal of the American Oriental Society 82 (1962), pp. 143-150.

_____. "Aspects of the Foreign Policies of David and Solomon," Journal of Near Eastern Studies 22 (1963), pp. 1-17.

_____. "The Kingdom of David and Solomon in its Contact with Egypt and Aram Naharim," The Biblical Archaeologist Reader II. Edited by David Noel Freedman and Edward F. Campbell. Garden City: Doubleday Anchor Books, 1964. pp. 89-98.

_____. "King Lists of the Old Babylonian Period and Biblical Genealogies," Journal of the American Oriental Society 88 (1968), pp. 163-173.

XUM

_____. "Northern Canaan and the Mari Texts," Near Eastern Archaeology in the Twentieth Century: Essays in Honor of Nelson Glueck. Edited by James A. Sanders. New York: Doubleday, 1970. pp. 164-177.

_____. "The Egyptian Decline in Canaan and the Sea Peoples," The World History of the Jewish People Vol. 3. London: Allen, 1971. pp. 23-38.

Marmorstein, E. "The Origins of Agricultural Feudalism in the Holy Land," Palestine Exploration Quarterly (1953), pp. 111-117.

Masson, V.M. "The Urban Revolution in South Turkmenia," Antiquity 42 (1968), pp. 178-187.

May, Herbert G. "A Sociological Approach to Hebrew Religion," Journal of Bible and Religion 12 (1944), pp. 98-106.

Mazar, Benjamin. "Canaan and the Canaanite," Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research 102 (1946), pp. 7-12.

_____. "The Cities of the Priest and Levites," Supplement to Vetus Testamentum 7 (1960), pp. 193-205.

_____. "The Military Elite of David," Vetus Testamentum 13 (1963), pp. 310-320.

_____. "The Sanctuary of Arad and the Family of Hobab the Kenite," Journal of Near Eastern Studies 24 (1965), pp. 297-303.

_____. "Canaan in the Patriarchal Age," The World History of the Jewish People Vol. 2. London: Allen 1970. pp. 169-187.

_____. "Canaan in the Egyptian New Kingdom Period: The Historical Development," The World History of the Jewish People Vol. 3 London: Allen, 1971. pp. 3-22.

_____. "Beginning of the Nation: The Exodus and the Conquest," The World History of the Jewish People Vol. 3. London: Allen, 1971. pp. 69-93.

Meek, Theophile J. "The Translation of Ger in the Hexateuch and its Bearing on the Documentary Hypothesis," Journal of Biblical Literature 49 (1930), pp. 172-180.

XUM

Meinhold, Johannes. "Die jahwistischen Berichte in Genesis 12-50," Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 39 (1921), pp. 42-57.

Mendelsohn, Isaac. "Guilds in Ancient Palestine," Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research 80 (1940), pp. 17-21.

_____. "The Canaanite Term for 'Free Proletarian'," Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research 83 (1941), pp. 36-39.

_____. "State Slavery in Ancient Palestine," Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research 85 (1942), pp. 14-17.

_____. "Free Artisans and Slaves in Mesopotamia," Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research 89 (1943), pp. 25-29.

_____. "Authority and Law in Canaan-Israel," Supplement to the Journal of the American Oriental Society 17 (1954), pp. 25-33.

_____. "New Light on the Ḫupšu," Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research 139 (1955), pp. 9-11.

_____. "Samuel's Denunciation of Kingship in the Light of the Akkadian Documents from Ugarit," Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research 143 (1956), pp. 17-22.

_____. "On Corvée Labor in Ancient Canaan and Israel," Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research 167 (1962), pp. 31-35.

_____. "Society and Economic Conditions," The World History of the Jewish People. Vol. 3. London: Allen, 1971. pp. 39-51.

Mendenhall, George. "Law and Covenant in Israel and in the Ancient Near East," The Biblical Archaeologist 17 (1954), pp. 26-46, 49-76.

_____. "The Hebrew Conquest of Palestine," Biblical Archaeologist 25 (1962), pp. 66-87.

Möhlenbrink, Kurt. "Die Landnahmesagen des Buches Josua," Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 56 (1938), pp. 238-268.

Morgenstern, Julian. "The Oldest Document of the Hexateuch," Hebrew Union College Annual 4 (1927), pp. 1-138.

XUM

_____. "A Note on Genesis 5: 29," Journal of Biblical Literature 49 (1930), pp. 306-309.

Mowinckel, Sigmund. "Der Ursprung der Bilaamsage," Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 48 (1930), pp. 233-271.

_____. "Rahelstämme' und 'Leastämme'," Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 77 (1958), pp. 129-150.

Mumford, Lewis, "The City: Its Forum and Functions," International Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences 16 Vols. Edited by David Sills. Chicago: The Free Press, 1968. Vol. 2, pp. 447-455.

MacKenzie, Roderick A.F. "The Divine Soliloquies," Catholic Biblical Quarterly 17 (1955), pp. 277-286.

_____. "The City and Israelite Religion," Catholic Biblical Quarterly 25 (1963), pp. 60-70.

McCown, Chester C. "City," The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible Vol. 1. New York: Abingdon Press, 1962. pp. 632-638.

McKenzie, John L. "The Literary Characteristics of Genesis 2-3," Theological Studies 15 (1954), pp. 541-572.

_____. "Elders in the Old Testament," Biblica 40 (1959), pp. 522-540.

Neufeld, Edward. "The Prohibitions against Loans at Interest," Hebrew Union College Annual 26 (1955), pp. 376-382.

_____. "The Emergence of a Royal-Urban Society in Ancient Israel," Hebrew Union College Annual 31 (1960), pp. 31-53.

Nielsen, Eduard. "Some Reflections on the History of the Ark," Supplement to Vetus Testamentum 7 (1960), pp. 61-74.

_____. "The Role of Oral Tradition in the Bible," Old Testament Issues. Edited by S. Sandmel. New York: Harper & Row, 1968. pp. 68-93.

North, Christopher R. "The Place of Oral Tradition in the Growth of the Old Testament," Expository Times 61 (1949-1950), pp. 292-296.

XUM

_____. "Pentateuchal Criticism," Old Testament in Modern Study. Edited by H.H. Rowley. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1961. pp. 48-83.

North, Robert. "Metallurgy in the Ancient Near East," Orientalia 24 (1955), pp. 78-88.

_____. "The Cain Music," Journal of Biblical Literature 83 (1964), pp. 373-389.

_____. "The Hivvites," Biblica 54 (1973), pp. 43-62.

Noth, Martin. "Die syrisch-palästinische Bevölkerung des zweiten Jahrtausends vor Chr. im Lichte neuer Quellen," Zeitschrift des Palästina-Vereins 65 (1942), pp. 9-27.

_____. "Jerusalem und die israelitische Tradition," Oudtestamentische Studiën 8 (1950), pp. 28-46.

_____. "The Homes of the Tribes in Palestine," Old Testament Issues, New York: Harper and Row, 1968. pp. 121-156.

Oates, Joan. "Prehistoric Settlement Patterns in Mesopotamia," Man, Settlement and Urbanism. Edited by P.J. Ucko, Ruth Tringham and G.W. Dimbleby. London: Duckworth, 1972. pp. 299-310.

Oppenheim, A. Leo. "A New Look at the Structure of Mesopotamian Society," Journal of the Economic and Social History of the Orient 10 (1967), pp. 1-16.

_____. "Mesopotamia: Land of Cities," Middle Eastern Cities. Edited by I. Lapidus. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1969. pp. 3-16.

Orlinsky, Harry M. "The Tribal System of Israel and Related Groups in the Period of the Judges," Oriens Antiquus 1 (1962), pp. 11-20.

Pedersen, Johannes. "Note on the Hebrew Hopsī," Journal of the Palestinian Oriental Society 4 (1926), pp. 103-105.

_____. "Die Auffassung vom Alten Testament," Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 49 (1931), pp. 161-181.

Perrot, Jean. "Premiers villages de Syrie et de Palestine," Compte Rendus de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres. Paris, 1968, pp. 161-177.

XUM

Pfeiffer, Robert H. "A Non-Israelite Source of the Book of Genesis," Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 48 (1930), pp. 66-73.

Piggott, S. "The Role of the City in Ancient Civilizations." The Metropolos in Modern Life, Edited by R.M. Fisher. Garden City: Doubleday, 1955. pp. 5-17.

Ploeg, van der, Jean. "Les chefs du people d'Israël et leurs titres," Revue Biblique 55 (1950), pp. 40-61.

Postgate, J.N. "The Role of the Temple in the Mesopotamian Secular Community," Man, Settlement and Urbanism, Edited by P.J. Ucko, Ruth Tringham, and G.W. Dimbleby. London: Duckworth, 1972. pp. 811-826.

Prado, Juan. "La Ciudad y Torre de Babel," Estudios Biblicos 9 (1950), pp. 273-294.

Prausnitz, M.W. "The First Agricultural Settlements in Galilee," Israel Exploration Journal 9 (1959), pp. 166-174.

Rainey, A.F. "Compulsory Labor Gangs in Ancient Israel," Israel Exploration Journal 20 (1970), pp. 191-202.

Rathjen, B.D. "Philistine and Hebrew Amphictyonies," Journal of Near Eastern Studies 24 (1965), pp. 100-104.

Ravn, O.E. "Der Turm zu Babel," Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gessellschaft 91 (1937), pp. 352-372.

Redfield, Robert. "The Folk Society," American Journal of Sociology 52 (1947), pp. 293-308.

Redford, Donald B. "The Land of the Hebrews in Genesis 10:15," Vetus Testamentum 15 (1965), pp. 529-532.

_____. "The Taxation System of Solomon," Studies in the Ancient Palestinian World, Edited by J.W. Weavers and D.B. Redford. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1971. pp. 141-156.

Reiner, Erica. "The Etiological Myth of the 'Seven Sages'" Orientalia 30 (1961), pp. 1-11.

XUM

Reiss, A.J. "An Analysis of Urban Phenomena," The Metropolis in Modern Life, Edited by R.M. Fisher. Garden City: Doubleday, 1955. pp. 43-48.

Reventlow, Henning G. "Das Amt des Mazkir," Theologische Zeitschrift 15 (1959), pp. 161-175.

Reviv, J. "The Shechem in the El-Amarna Period and in the Days of Abimelech," Israel Exploration Journal 16 (1966), pp. 252-257.

_____. "On Urban Representative Institutions and Self-government in Syria-Palestine in the Second Half of the Second Millenium B.C.," Journal of the Economic and Social History of the Orient 12 (1969), pp. 283-297.

Rhodokanakis, Nicolaus. "Genesis 2-4," Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 39 (1921), pp. 76-83.

Rivkin, Ellis. "The Internal City: Jerusalem and Urbanization," Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion 5 (1965-1966), pp. 225-240.

Rothenberg, Beno. "Ancient Copper Industries in the Western Arabah," Palestine Exploration Quarterly 94 (1962), pp. 5-71.

Rowley, Harold H. "Zadok and Nehustan," Journal of Biblical Literature 58 (1939), pp. 113-141.

_____. "Ras Shamra and the Habiru Question," Palestinian Exploration Quarterly 72 (1940), pp. 90-94.

_____. "Habiru and Hebrew," Palestinian Exploration Quarterly 74 (1942), pp. 41-53.

_____. "Melchizedek and Zadok (Genesis 14 and Psalms 110)," Festschrift für Alfred Bertholet, Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1950. pp. 461-472.

_____. "Moses and Monotheism," From Moses to Qumran, New York: Association Press, 1963. pp. 35-63.

Rowton, Michael. "The Topological Factor in the Hapiru Problem," Studies in Honor of Benno Landsberger On His Twenth-fifth Birthday, April 21, 1965. Assyriological Studies. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1965. No. 16. pp. 375-387.

XUM

_____. "The Woodlands of Ancient Western Asia," Journal of Near Eastern Studies 26 (1967), pp. 261-277.

_____. "Enclosed Nomadism," Journal of the Economic and Social History of the Orient 17 (1974), pp. 1-30.

Sahlins, Marshall D. "Political Power and Economy in Primitive Society," Essays in the Science of Culture: In Honor of Leslie A. White, Edited by Gertrude Evelyn Dale and Robert L. Carneiro. New York: Crowell, 1960. pp. 407-421.

St. Gervitz, A. "Jericho and Shechem: Religio-Literary aspect of City Destruction," Vetus Testamentum 13 (1963), pp. 52-62.

Sandmel, Samuel. "Genesis 4:26b," Two Living Traditions: Essays on Religion and Bible. Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1972. pp. 305-315.

Sauermann, O. "Bemerkungen zum Kainzeichen, Genesis 4: 15b," Antonianum 33 (1958), pp. 45-56.

Schmökel, Hartmut. "Jahwe und die Kenites," Journal of Biblical Literature 52 (1933), pp. 212-229.

_____. "Zur Datierung der Pentateuchquelle J," Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 62 (1950), pp. 319-321.

Sellers, Ovid. "Problems in the Story of Cain," C.L. Pyatt Festschrift, To Do and To Teach. Edited by Roscoe M. Pierson. Lexington, Kentucky: College of the Bible, 1953. pp. 53-64.

Simpson, Cuthbert A. "The Growth of the Hexateuch," The Interpreter's Bible. Vol. 1. New York: Abingdon Press, 1952. pp. 185-200.

_____. "The Book of Genesis, Introduction and Exegesis," The Interpreter's Bible. Vol. 1. New York: Abingdon Press, 1952. pp. 439-829.

Sjoberg, Gideon. "Folk and 'Feudal' Societies," American Journal of Sociology 58 (1952), pp. 231-239.

_____. "The Pre-Industrial City," Cities and Society. Edited by P. Hatt and A.J. Reiss. Glencoe: The Free Press, 1964. pp. 179-188.

XUM

Smith, H.S. "Society and Settlement in Ancient Egypt," Man, Settlement and Urbanism, Edited by P.J. Ucko, Ruth Tringham and G.W. Dimbleby. London: Duckworth, 1972. pp. 705-720.

Snaith, Norman H. "The Historical Books," Old Testament in Modern Study. Edited by H.H. Rowley. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1961. pp. 84-90.

Speiser, Ephraim A. "Ethnic Movements in the Near East in the Second Millenium B.C.," Annual of the American Schools of Oriental Research 13 (1933), pp. 13-54.

_____. "The Hurrian Participation in the Civilizations of Mesopotamia, Syria and Palestine," Journal of World History 1 (1953), pp. 311-327.

_____. "Authority and Law in Mesopotamia," Journal of the American Oriental Society, Suppl. 17 (1954), pp. 8-15.

_____. "Word Plays on the Creation Epic's Version of the Founding of Babylon," Orientalia 25 (1956), pp. 317-323.

_____. "'People' and 'Nation' of Israel," Journal of Biblical Literature 79 (1960), pp. 157-163.

_____. "Mesopotamia-Evolution of an integrated civilization," The World History of the Jewish People Vol. 1. London: Allen, 1964. pp. 173-266.

_____. "The Manner of the King," The World History of the Jewish People Vol. 3. London: Allen, 1971. pp. 280-287.

Stade, B. "Beiträge zur Pentateuchkritik: I, Das Kainzeichen," Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 14 (1894), pp. 250-318.

_____. "Beiträge zur Pentateuchkritik: Der Thurm zu Babel," Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 15 (1895), pp. 157-166.

Stewart, C.T., Jr. "The Rural-Urban Dichotomy: Concepts and Uses," American Journal of Sociology 64 (1958), pp. 152-158.

Talmon, Shemaryahu. "The Desert Motif in the Bible and Qumran Literature," Biblical Motifs: Origins and Transformations. Edited by A. Altman. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1966. pp. 31-64.

XUM

Thureau-Dangin, Francois. "Trois Contrats de Ras-Shamra," Syria 18 (1937), pp. 246-255.

Van Buren, E. Douglas. "Homage to a Deified King," Zeitschrift für Assyriologische und Vorder Asiatische Archäologie 16 (1952), pp. 92-120.

Vincent, Leon-Hugues. "Site primitif de Jérusalem et son évolution initiale," Revue Biblique 65 (1958), pp. 161-180.

Volz, Paul and Rudolph, Wilhelm. "Der Elohist als Erzähler ein Irrweg der Pentateuchkritik," Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft, 63. Giessen: Alfred Topelmann, 1933. pp. 1-183.

Wallis, Gerhard. "Die Stadt in den Überlieferungen der Genesis," Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 78 (1966), pp. 133-148.

Westermann, Claus. "Kainiten," Biblische Kommentar Altes Testament 1:6 Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukircher Verlag des Erziehungsvereins, 1970. pp. 436-467.

Wheeler, Sir Mortimer. "The First Towns?" Antiquity 30 (1956), pp. 132-136.

Wilson, John A. "The 'Eperu of the Egyptian Inscriptions," American Journal of Semitic Literature 49 (1933), pp. 275-280.

_____. "The Assembly of a Phoenician City," Journal of Near Eastern Studies 4 (1945), p. 245.

_____. "Civilization without Cities," The City Invincible: A Symposium on Urbanization and Cultural Development in the Ancient Near East. Edited by Robert McC. Adams and C. Kraeling. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1960. pp. 125-165.

Wirth, Louis. "Urbanism as a Way of Life," American Journal of Sociology 44 (1938), pp. 46-63.

_____. "The Urban Society and Civilization," American Journal of Sociology 45 (1940), pp. 743-755.

Wolf, C.U. "Terminology of Israel's Tribal Organization," Journal of Biblical Literature 65 (1946), pp. 45-49.

_____. "Some Remarks on the Tribes and Clans of Israel," Jewish Quarterly Review 36 (1946), pp. 287-295.

_____. "Traces of a Primitive Democracy in Ancient Israel," Journal of Near Eastern Studies 6 (1947), pp. 98-108.

_____. "Village," Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible, Vol. 4. New York: Abingdon Press, 1962. p. 784.

_____. "Nomadism," Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible. Vol. 3. New York: Abingdon Press, 1962. pp. 558-560.

Wolff, Hans Walter. "The Kerygma of the Yahwist," Interpretation 20 (1966), pp. 131-158.

_____. "Masters and Slaves: On Overcoming Class-Struggle in the Old Testament," Interpretation 27 (1973), pp. 259-272.

Wooley, Leonard Sir. "The Urbanization of Society," Journal of World History 4 (1957), pp. 236-272.

Wright, G. Ernest. "Epic of the Conquest," The Biblical Archaeologist 3 (1940), pp. 25-40.

_____. "Phillistine Coffins and Mercenaries," The Biblical Archaeologist Reader. II. Edited by David Noel Freedman and Edward F. Campbell. Garden City: Doubleday Anchor Books. 1964. pp. 59-69.

_____. "The Archaeology of Palestine," The Bible and the Ancient Near East. Edited by G. Ernest Wright. Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday Anchor Books, 1965. pp. 89-93.

Yadin, Yigael. "Warfare in the Second Millenium B.C.E.," The World History of the Jewish People Vol. 2. London: Allen, 1970. pp. 127-159.

Yeivin, Shemuel. "Social, Religious and Cultural Trends in Jerusalem under the Davidic Dynasty," Vetus Testamentum 3 (1953), pp. 148-166.

Young, Jr., T.C. "Population Densities and Early Mesopotamian Urbanism." Man, Settlement and Urbanism. Edited by P.J. Ucko, Ruth Tringham, and G.W. Dimbleby. London: Duckworth, 1972, pp. 827-842.

XUM

Zeydner, A. "Kainszeichen, Keniter und Beschneidung," Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 18 (1898), pp. 120-125.

UNPUBLISHED MATERIALS

Adams, Robert McC. "Level and Trend in Early Sumerian Civilization." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Department of Anthropology, University of Chicago, 1956.

Bellefontaine, M. Elizabeth. "A Study of Ancient Israelite Laws and Their Function as Covenant Stipulations." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Department of Theology, University of Notre Dame, 1973.

Bess, S. Herbert. "Systems of Land Tenure in Ancient Israel." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Department of Near Eastern Language and Literature, University of Michigan. 1963.

Flanagan, James W. "A Study of the Biblical Traditions Pertaining to the Foundation of the Monarchy of Israel." Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Department of Theology, University of Notre Dame, 1970.

Frick, Frank Smith. "City in the Old Testament," Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Department of Religion, Princeton University, 1970.

Glock, Albert E. "Warfare in Mari and Early Israel." Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Department of Near Eastern Language and Literature, University of Michigan, 1968.

Luke, J.T. "Pastoralism and Politics at Mari in the Mari Period; A Re-examination of the Character and Political Significance of the Major West Semitic Tribal Groups on the Middle Euphrates, ca. 18 28-1758 B.C." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Department of Near Eastern Language and Literature, University of Michigan, 1965.

XUM